

THE SATURDAY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 899, Vol. 35.

January 18, 1873.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

GENERAL SCHOUVALOFF'S MISSION.

ALTHOUGH the mission of General SCHOUVALOFF deserves all the interest which it has excited, the exact purport of his instructions is still open to conjecture. The secrecy which sometimes excites the indignation of impatient patriots is still an indispensable condition of diplomacy; and Lord GRANVILLE is perfectly right in not taking the newspapers into his confidence. The statement that the English Government had addressed a remonstrance or a warning to the Court of St. Petersburg was at first received with incredulous surprise; and it is not yet known whether it was literally true; but it is probable that the negotiations which have since taken place began with some communication from the English Ambassador. The immediate occasion of the discussion seems to have been the project of a renewed attack upon Khiva. A Russian expedition was a few months ago compelled to return without accomplishing its object; and consequently the Russian Government has determined to repeat the attempt with forces which can scarcely fail to ensure success. Three armies from as many different directions are to converge on Khiva; and probably they will overrun the territory and occupy the capital without encountering serious resistance. The ulterior intentions of the Russian Government are still uncertain. According to one probable statement, a large majority of a Council specially summoned to consider the question preferred the proposal of a permanent conquest to the alternative plan of a temporary invasion such as the march of POLLOCK on Cabul, or the more recent Abyssinian campaign. Although great questions of policy are probably not determined in Russia by majorities, the vote of a Council would indicate the policy of the EMPEROR and his Ministers. The reasons which may be urged in favour of the annexation by a civilized Power of the territory of a predatory border State are familiar to students of Indian history. It is sometimes safer and cheaper to govern neighbouring tribes than to repel their incursions. The rulers of Khiva can scarcely be trusted to observe the treaties which they may be compelled to conclude; and it is possible that under the stern rule of Russian officers the inhabitants might gradually acquire peaceable and orderly habits. There is a Russian flotilla in the Sea of Aral; and the occupation of the country would be facilitated by the water communication on the Oxus, especially if by drainage of swamps or by other methods the Russians could deal with the singular plague of insects which renders parts of the shores of the river uninhabitable. The natural capabilities of the oasis of Khiva are said to be considerable; but a long interval must elapse before the profits of Khivan commerce or industry would pay the expense of conquest. The Russians have hitherto sought in Central Asia, not terminal stations, but rights of way to more distant regions, and Khiva lies between the territory of the Empire and the newly acquired dependency of Bokhara.

While analogy and probability point to a policy of conquest, several English and foreign papers positively state that both Count SCHOUVALOFF and Count BRUNNOW have assured the English Government that the expedition to Khiva will return as soon as its object has been attained by a display of irresistible force, and by the release of the Russian prisoners in Khiva. It is added that no proposal for a line of demarcation between the two Empires can have been made by the English Ambassador at St. Petersburg; and this part of the statement may be confidently accepted as accurate. It is in the highest degree improbable that the English Government should have offered to recognize a frontier beyond the actual limits of the Russian dominions in Asia; but it is not equally certain that some boundaries may not have been indicated

which could not be transgressed without risk of collision. It is well known that the complacent approval of Russian aggression which has often been gratuitously expressed in England meets with no kind of sympathy in India. It is not improbable that, after repelling the agent of the Khan of KHIVA who lately asked for his mediation or good offices, the VICEROY may have called the attention of the Home Government to the risk which might arise from the further progress of Russian arms in Central Asia. That Mr. GLADSTONE and his colleagues should have so far taken alarm as to enter into diplomatic communications with Russia on the subject is a sufficient proof that the danger is not altogether imaginary. The report that satisfactory assurances have been offered by Russia cannot be hastily accepted. If it were understood that the impending expedition to Khiva is to be merely a demonstration of superior force, there would be no sufficient reason for the negotiations which are notoriously in progress. The moderate and unambitious language which is attributed to the Russian Government offers a singular contrast to the hostile tone which is habitually adopted by the journals of St. Petersburg and Moscow. That all newspapers in Russia are positively or negatively subject to official control or inspiration is sufficiently proved by the absolute silence which they have maintained on the subject of General SCHOUVALOFF's mission. It is evident that a Government which exercises the power of prohibiting unseasonable comments must at least tolerate the opinions which are allowed to find utterance. Since the introduction of a limited freedom of discussion in Russia, the newspapers have been employed as irregular auxiliaries of the diplomacy of the Government; and for a long time they have been in the habit of using unfriendly and menacing language to England. Even Lord NORTHBROOK's refusal to interfere on behalf of Khiva was described by some Russian journals as an act of undue presumption. It is easy to understand that it may suit the Imperial Government to contrast the moderation of its official demeanour with the arrogance of writers who are ostensibly unauthorised; but it is scarcely probable that the entire scheme of Russian policy in Central Asia can have been systematically misrepresented by the journals.

If it is true that General SCHOUVALOFF has been instructed to repudiate the purpose of annexing Khiva, there can be no doubt that he has also stipulated for some equivalent concession on the part of England. It would be a great advantage to Russia to conclude a treaty of demarcation which would practically involve an alliance with England against the independent Mahometan States which might be included within the area of permissible conquest. On the other hand, the inconvenience to the English Government of any similar arrangement is universally acknowledged, while a formal notification of the line beyond which no advance could be tolerated would effect the purpose of the treaty without involving any reciprocal obligations. The only result of a boundary convention would be that Russia would not pass the agreed limits except as an act of war, and precisely the same penalty would attach to disregard of a formal intimation on the part of England. Only a few years have passed since Russia covenanted, not only with England, but with all the Great Powers of Europe, to abstain from the maintenance of a naval force in the Black Sea. As soon as it was thought safe to incur the possible consequences the treaty was deliberately renounced; and the English Government thought fit to surrender its rights rather than to assert them by force, or to reserve them with a view to future contingencies. It might in ten or twenty years be found not less inconsistent with the dignity of the Imperial Government to recognize any limit to its annexations in Asia than to abide by the restriction on its operations in the Black Sea.

Another reason against the supposed project of treaty may be found in the uncertainty of the circumstances which might attend any future annexation. A conquest or expedition which involved the co-operation of Persia, or the friendship or enmity of Afghanistan, could not be indifferent to Indian interests, although the immediate enterprise might not extend beyond the stipulated limits. It is not prudent to assent beforehand to any engagement of which the application and the consequences cannot be distinctly foreseen. There is no reason to believe that General SCHOUVALOFF's proposals are at the same time so simple and so unacceptable as the project of a boundary treaty.

The danger from the Russian conquests in Central Asia which has been apprehended in England is the same which has been constantly held out as a menace by Russian writers. No reasonable fear can be entertained of a Russian invasion of India; because it could only be undertaken with comparatively scanty resources against an enormous superiority both in numbers and in the quality of armaments. As long as the Suez Canal was open it would be much easier to send reinforcements to India from England than from any part of European Russia; and on the whole it may be confidently asserted that no enterprise of the kind will be attempted for many years to come. Nevertheless the possession of India would be made more expensive and more troublesome by the vicinity of a powerful rival; and Russian politicians have long flattered themselves that, by encouraging or threatening disturbances in India, their Government would have the means of putting a pressure upon English policy in other parts of the world. It is highly probable that General SCHOUVALOFF is at present engaged in trying in the most conciliatory form some experiment of the kind. It would be a brilliant stroke of diplomacy to obtain, in consideration for a postponement of the annexation of Khiva, concessions which the acquisition of the Khanate might perhaps serve as an alternative method of extorting. On the other hand, it is not improbable that the English Cabinet may require some security against encroachments in other quarters. There are indications of a disposition on the part of the Russian Government to tighten its hold on Persia, which might become a more formidable neighbour to India than any barbarous State in Central Asia. It is from the West rather than from the North that an invasion of India, if it were in any way practicable, might be attempted with the most reasonable prospect of success; and in the meantime the Persians, who have often given trouble on their own account by encroachments on Afghan territory, would become formidable if their enterprises were supported and backed by Russia. The increased influence of Russian diplomacy at Constantinople which has naturally resulted from the rupture of the Treaty of Paris may perhaps suggest other reasons for precaution. If Russia is really desirous of a friendly understanding, there ought to be no insurmountable difficulty in settling the terms of an arrangement; but for the present no sanguine expectation can be founded on General SCHOUVALOFF's visit.

THE EMPEROR AND THE IMPERIALISTS.

THE ceremonies preceding and attending the funeral of the EMPEROR were in accordance with the traditions of Royalty, and were redeemed from being a mere show by the sincerity of the respectful feelings by which they were accompanied. But there is something ghastly in the pageantry of death, and there is a relief in thinking that it is at an end. Although the grief for the EMPEROR may not have been very profound in Paris, and although occasion was taken by some of the enemies of the Empire to show an indifference or exultation beyond the bounds of good taste, yet there was a decent appearance of mourning on the day of the funeral, and a large body of Frenchmen of all ranks were in attendance at Chislehurst. That the friends of the Empire who have thrown in their political fortunes with those of Imperialism should be there was a matter of course, but there appears to have been a numerous gathering of those who valued or regretted the EMPEROR sufficiently to make a long journey without any political motive, merely to testify their respect to his memory. Ample evidence was also given of the favourable sentiments of Englishmen to a sovereign who was at least a friend of this country, and who appealed to the sympathies of the public by the greatness of his misfortunes and the fortitude with which he bore them. The Royal Family took part in the general manifestation so as to satisfy all the claims of a dynasty the head of which has been long on excellent terms with the family of the QUEEN, but not so as to mark any

prepossession that could be twisted into having a political meaning. The friends of the BONAPARTES are perfectly aware that the civilities which the different members of foreign Royal families receive here are not intended to show any preference as between one Government of a foreign country and another. The ORLEANS Princes have only lately left England, where they were received with as much cordiality and respect as the family of their chief adversary can possibly hope to receive. One country alone has justly discharged a special debt of gratitude by paying exceptional honours to the memory of the EMPEROR. Italy has not been so mean as to forget or to refuse to acknowledge its recollection of the services rendered to her by NAPOLEON III. The French irritated the Italians on many occasions. The EMPEROR himself often thwarted them, and he left it to Prussia to complete the work of liberation he had begun; but still the indisputable fact remains, that united Italy owes its existence to the late exile of Chislehurst; and the Italians have warmly recognized what they owed him, and have marked their sense of their obligations by the readiness with which they have made his death an occasion of paying the last tribute of respect they could bestow.

The Imperialist journalists in France have got very buoyant and excited under the influence of events which have attracted so much notice to their chief, and have stated plainly how hopeful they are of the future, and how fondly they are attached to NAPOLEON IV. Their Radical adversaries have naturally complained of the license accorded to the Imperialists, and no demonstrations against the existing order of things could have been more bitter or more unguarded. But the Government has taken a very sensible view of the matter. It has replied that the interval between the death and the funeral of the EMPEROR might properly be regarded as an exceptional time during which utterances of party affection or party spirit in favour of the EMPEROR might be overlooked; but that when things returned to their ordinary state proceedings would not be tolerated which would then be not testimonies of respect to a deceased chief, but attempts to subvert the existing Government. Much the same may be said of most that has been written in the last few days both in England and abroad as to the EMPEROR and his career. What has been expressed has been not the deliberate judgment of calm critics, but the passing opinion of men whom good feeling prompted not to be behindhand in saying all the good that could be fairly said of a remarkable man just dead. While the EMPEROR was reigning in his glory, and still more when he was conducting, or had just conducted, France to her ruin, the consideration of the salient points of his personal character naturally occupied very little of the attention of the public. It was quite irrelevant to a discussion of the Mexican expedition, or of the means by which plébiscites were obtained, or of the early days of the German war, that the EMPEROR was steady in his friendships, kind-hearted, ready to listen to newcomers, free from sordidness and parsimony. On the other hand, when the EMPEROR died in exile and under a cloud, it seemed harsh to dwell on the faults of his political career, and his personal qualities came into sudden prominence. This was quite right. Justice cannot be done to any one all at once, and there is a time for blaming and a time for praising. But now that the excitement of his death and funeral is over, criticism must gradually resume its usual course. Nothing new has been found out to the credit of the EMPEROR which was not previously known, and a man who took upon himself to govern a great country for twenty years must be judged mainly as a governor and not as a private man. There is no means of casting off from the memory of the EMPEROR the burden of responsibility which attached to him while he was alive and had France in his power. However kind, and patient, and resolute he may have been, and whatever may have been his good intentions, he began his Empire with the *Coup d'état* and ended it with Sedan, and he, like other men, must be judged by his deeds, and his works must be measured by their fruits.

The Imperialists affect to be in no way disheartened by the death of the EMPEROR. To them one Emperor is dead and another has begun his reign. The new Emperor will be, they point out, of age next year; that is, he will be a boy eighteen years old. No necessity, therefore, occurs for the creation of a Regency. That France would not much like a woman as a Regent, and that Prince NAPOLEON could not be trusted to replace the EMPRESS, is therefore a matter of indifference to them. They will have their Emperor ready quite as soon as they can get an Empire ready for him to reign over; and they pretend to be

perfectly confident that the time must come when the Imperial Government will be restored. Nor is it to be supposed that they are merely trusting to the chapter of chances, and, on the principle that nothing happens in France except what is unexpected, believe in the restoration of the Empire simply because it is improbable. They mean something when they talk of the Empire as an abiding institution, and see vitality in nothing but Imperialism. To most men the late EMPEROR appeared inseparable from the Second Empire, and the Empire endured because the EMPEROR was there to make it endure. This is not at all the genuine Imperialist theory. Its partisans look on Imperialism as simply the true way of governing France. It is, as they sometimes term it, the modern form of monarchy, and they offer France at once the strength of monarchy and an accordance with modern ideas. The EMPEROR did not manage the Empire by himself; he had a band of resolute men, capable of daring anything, and understanding the machinery of government, ready at hand to assist him; and the disasters of his later years were, in the opinion of ardent Imperialists, mainly owing to the fact that he never replaced these associates as he lost them with men of anything like equal resolution and ability. If a new DE MORYN, a new PERSIGNY, and a new ST. ARNAUD managed somehow to get hold of the reins of power, they could carry on affairs according to the true pattern of Imperialism in the name of a weak lad as well as under any other shelter. Once placed in power, they could bribe and pamper the army, make use of the priests, drill voters through préfets and maires, get plébiscites made in any quantity to order, use artillery in the streets, and deport wholesale to Cayenne. In return for the country permitting this, or looking on helplessly while it was done, they could find work for artisans, help the country to grow rich, use the finest phrases about nationalities, and do everything they did in the name of the people. There are a great many Frenchmen who sincerely believe that, apart from the prizes which this mode of governing would bring to those who got hold of the top places, it is the only way of governing France that really suits France. There are still more who are not quite sure whether it is a good way of governing France or not, who regret the Empire for various personal reasons, and who, if the Republic came to be discredited, might be persuaded that Imperialism was again worth trying, and that it would at least save them the trouble of further thought. This whole view of politics seems to us founded on a mistake, and the real truth appears to be that Imperialism, detestable in itself, was only saved for a time from the obloquy it merited by the late EMPEROR being in many respects better than his Empire. The disasters that attended his downfall, the decay of the Napoleonic legend, the growing sense and sad experience of the people will, it may be hoped, make a new triumph of Imperialism impossible. But in estimating the prospects of France and the chances and aims of French parties, it would be a great mistake to overlook the fact that Imperialism means something distinct from any particular Emperor, and that the Imperialists have a system which they wish to revive, and not merely a boy whom they choose to honour, when they proclaim their adhesion to the cause of NAPOLEON IV.

MR. LOWE AND THE MALT-TAX DEPUTATION.

THE dissatisfaction which must have been felt with Mr. Lowe's answer to the Malt-tax deputation will extend beyond the Chambers of Agriculture. It had indeed not been expected that even a part of the tax would be removed in the present year; but the announcement that there is no large surplus will produce general disappointment; and it could scarcely have been expected that Mr. Lowe would seize so irrelevant an occasion of indicating the wish of the Government to sow dissension between landlords and tenants. The non-existence of a surplus can only be explained by some financial arrangement which will not be universally approved; nor is it difficult to guess the nature of the contrivance by which demands for the reduction of taxation are to be evaded. In popular language, the excess of the revenue over the expenditure of the current year is sometimes confounded with the surplus which may be disclosed in the forthcoming Budget. When a Chancellor of the Exchequer officially speaks of a surplus, he refers exclusively to the estimates of future receipt and expenditure; and the actual state of the public finances is only so far material as it may supply a basis for calculation. It has always been known that the payment of the American damages under the Geneva Award would absorb the whole or the greater part of the

surplus either of this year or of the next. It may be inferred from Mr. Lowe's announcement that he has applied the current surplus in the ordinary course to the reduction of the Debt, and that the whole amount of damages will appear in the Budget as a part of the estimated expenditure for 1873-1874. The Government will probably decline any responsibility for a course of action which is prescribed by law. The Commissioners of the National Debt are bound on the certificate of the Treasury to apply surplus funds as they accrue to the redemption of debt; but, on the other hand, the Chancellor of the Exchequer must have a certain discretion as to the amount of the disposable balance. It would certainly have been in the power of the Government to apply, with or without the express sanction of Parliament, the excess of the current revenue to the discharge of an obligation which is as much a debt as if it had formed a part of the Consolidated Annuities. It has been known since the middle of September that the payment of the damages would be due in July; and when so considerable a charge was imposed on the national capital, the reduction of the ordinary debt might perhaps have been suspended. It is impossible to suppose that when Mr. Lowe declares that there will be no considerable surplus he can mean that a surplus which would otherwise exist has been appropriated by the Cabinet either to the relief of local taxation or to any other voluntary purpose. There can now be no doubt that the American damages will be included in the estimated expenditure of next year. If it had happened that the payment had become due a few months sooner, there would have been a surplus of three millions.

Mr. Lowe thoroughly understands the great principles of political economy, but he sometimes overlooks the limitations which are involved in the very nature of the science. An economist, like a mathematician, reasons on assumptions which are never exactly true in practice. If a scientific mechanician were informed by a carpenter whom he had employed to make a model that his calculations would not work, he would immediately conclude that he had not made a sufficient allowance either for friction or for some peculiarity in the nature of the materials. When all the farmers of England have made up their minds that the Malt-tax injuriously affects their operations, a cautious financier might perhaps doubt the certainty of his own conclusions to the contrary; but it is not in Mr. Lowe's character to prefer empirical results to the supposed consequences of logical demonstration. The members of the deputation had laid much stress on the burden imposed by the Malt-tax on the consumer; and some of them asserted, with a perhaps excessive pretence of accuracy, that the duty was equivalent to an Income-tax of 5d. in the pound on a labourer's income. Other speakers added that beer was an indispensable element in the production of corn, because the labourer would not work without it; but perhaps they failed to discern the obvious inference that, if they were right, the burden fell rather on the employer than on the workman. Their general doctrine, that taxes on commodities chiefly affect the consumer, was both sound in itself and consistent with Mr. Lowe's economic orthodoxy. He declared with evident sincerity that he would willingly relieve the working classes and other consumers of beer if only he had been able to spare their contributions to the revenue; and he took occasion to add that he was not disposed to inquire too minutely into the quantity of beer which the labourer might, in the exercise of his discretion, think fit to drink. It is possible that, as Mr. Lowe said, cheap beer might promote temperance, by partially displacing more deleterious liquors, and, at the worst, a man who has drunk too much beer is less offensive than a man who has drunk too much gin. Although the bulk of indirect taxation is paid by the consumer, it is evident that any consequent diminution of demand must also affect the profits of the producers. The landowners and farmers who waited on Mr. Lowe can scarcely have needed to be told that barley would not be grown unless it returned an average profit to the cultivator; but they also knew that if more beer were drunk their production might be advantageously extended; and they had stated in detail the injurious effect of the Malt duty on the provision of food for cattle. One Suffolk farmer asserted that on one hundred acres of barley the tax amounted to 540*l.*; and it can scarcely be assumed that the whole of the charge is recovered from the purchaser. It has not generally been thought in England that the French tax on raw materials tends to encourage manufacturing industry; nor would any Chancellor of the Exchequer succeed in convincing a Lancashire Chamber of Commerce that a duty upon cotton would fall exclusively on the wearers of calico. There is nothing special in malt which can justify

a tax on a partially manufactured article, except that the vast consumption secures an enormous return to the Exchequer. The Malt-tax sustains itself by its own bulk and weight.

The most objectionable part of Mr. Lowe's reply was his gratuitous attempt to distinguish between the incidence of the tax on landlords and on tenants. When two classes, assuming that their interests are identical, complain of a common grievance, it is at least an invidious task to prove to them on scientific grounds that they are labouring under a misapprehension. One of Mr. Lowe's colleagues has proposed to meet the joint complaint of owners and occupiers in the matter of local rates by redistributing the burden between them; and in pursuance of the same policy Mr. Lowe informs the tenant farmers that the Malt-tax, as far as it is not paid by the consumers, is a burden not on their profits but on the rent. It follows from Mr. Lowe's doctrine that it would be impossible by the imposition of the most perverse and extravagant burdens on agriculture to do the farmer any harm. A tax of twenty per cent. on grain, on cattle, on turnips and mangold, would not justify a deputation of farmers in making a complaint to the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and it might with equal plausibility be contended that the absurdest system of taxation would be innocuous to any other branch of industry. The commutation of tithes which had been supposed to remove a heavy burden on agriculture proves, if Mr. Lowe is in the right, to have been only a boon to landlords.

It was perhaps scarcely courteous to inform a body of intelligent farmers, representing large numbers engaged in the same business, that they were mere dupes, unconsciously put forward to fight the landlords' battles. Mr. Lowe is not in the habit of suppressing unpalatable truths; and "he does not scruple to say that, whatever benefit would be derived from 'taking off the tax beyond that derived by the consumer,' would necessarily fall into the rent. It would be assumed 'that your holdings were more profitable because the tax was taken off, and then, if you are content, and if people like you are content to hold your land at its present rate, others would come in and bid against you in the hope of realizing the profit you did, and you would either have to pay that portion of 'profit to the landlord, or be replaced by others who would be willing to do so.'" When a Minister finds it his duty to enounce disagreeable propositions, he ought at least first to ascertain that they are true. Mr. Lowe might advantageously have remembered that the members of the deputation might possibly understand their own business sufficiently well to discern unsuspected flaws in his sublime demonstration. If all tenants in England held at extreme rack rents determined from year to year by every turn of the market, and if custom and feeling gave them no goodwill in their holdings and no preference over new comers, Mr. Lowe's arguments would be applicable to their condition. As an entirely opposite relation actually prevails between landlords and tenants, it is certainly not true that they would, as a general rule, be deprived by the competition of strangers of any benefit which might result from the repeal of the Malt-tax. Mr. Lowe may be right in his assertion that, if the repeal of the Corn-laws had largely diminished the profits of farming, the loss would have mainly fallen on the landlords. An increase or decrease of twenty per cent. in the value of the land would immediately affect the rent; an increase of two or three per cent. would be retained by the tenant. The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER will find that he has failed to satisfy the farmers that the Malt-tax is not a grievance inflicted on themselves, as it is undoubtedly a fiscal anomaly. The sum produced is too large to be sacrificed in any single year, but it might be judicious at the earliest opportunity to reduce it by one half, as a step towards a total repeal. As the brewers took no part in the deputation, the effect of the tax on a valuable branch of export trade was not mentioned in the course of the discussion.

THE UNITED STATES AND CUBA.

M. R. FISH published at Washington on the 10th of January the abstract of a remarkable letter which he had addressed to General SICKLES, as American Minister at Madrid, on the 29th of October. The Spanish Government has since formally declared that no such communication had been received at Madrid. It appears, therefore, that the document was originally intended in the first instance for home use; and probably General SICKLES may have been instructed to delay the communication to the present time. It is evidently impossible that the Spanish Opposition should both have forged an apparently official document and procured its insertion in

the New York papers; yet no argument which could have been devised would have been so embarrassing to the promoters of emancipation as the American despatch. The remarkable coincidence between the publication of the despatch and the pro-slavery agitation at Madrid indicates American rather than Spanish ingenuity. If the abstract of Mr. Fish's letter to General SICKLES is genuine, it follows that the moderate language of the PRESIDENT'S Message on the subject of Cuba conveyed a false impression. The rumour which was circulated on the eve of the Presidential election, for the purpose probably of influencing popular feeling, appears to have been strictly accurate. The journals which supported the candidature of General GRANT frequently contained statements to the effect that his second term of office would be distinguished by a more active and aggressive system of foreign policy; and now it appears that the American squadron in the Pacific is ordered to the Sandwich Islands, while designs upon Cuba are almost openly avowed. It was perhaps in preparation for the disturbance of friendly relations that the PRESIDENT and the SECRETARY OF STATE had previously insisted on retaining a Minister at Madrid who was personally and officially obnoxious to the Spanish Government. General SICKLES is "instructed to remonstrate in 'decisive but respectful terms against the apparent failure of Spain to carry into effect emancipation and other reforms promised in her West Indian Colonies.'" If it is asked what the United States have to do with any kind of reform in the Spanish dominions, the answer is obvious, if not wholly satisfactory. America is strong and Spain is weak, and America covets the possession of territory which can scarcely be appropriated without some preliminary pretext of quarrel. "The United States Government has," it seems, "a warm interest in the orderly condition of Cuba, and its watchfulness is severely strained to preserve neutrality." A few years ago the watchfulness of another Government was severely strained to preserve neutrality, not in a sporadic insurrection of rebels without standing army, head-quarters, or visible government, but between two powerful belligerents disposing of vast armaments and conducting regular hostilities with varied fortunes. It was not then thought by the Government of the United States that the difficulty of preserving strict neutrality could serve as an excuse for threatening interference in favour of insurgents. On the contrary, Mr. Fish, in the name of General GRANT, demanded damages to the amount of three or four hundred millions, because the vigilance of the English Government had not been sufficient to prevent the evasion of three or four unarmed cruisers destined for the service of the Confederates. Mr. Fish now informs the Spanish Government with insulting coolness that "the trial of its impartiality by 'the want of success on the part of Spain is so severe that, unless she soon becomes more successful, it will force upon the United States Government the consideration of the question whether a duty to itself and the commercial interests of its citizens may not demand a change in the line of action hitherto pursued." If the American agents at Geneva could have referred to a similar despatch as proceeding from the English Government, their libellous acrimony might have had some shadow of excuse.

There is some reason to fear that the publication of the document after an interval of two months indicates a purpose of active interference; but the immediate motive for offering a public affront to Spain may perhaps be found in Señor ZORRILLA's recent declaration of policy. The KING and both Houses of the Cortes have, in conformity with the proposal of the Minister, formally recorded their intention to abolish slavery during the present year in Porto Rico; yet it is known that emancipation is to be strongly resisted, and the most plausible excuse for opposition is the suggestion that the Government is acting in obedience to the dictation of the United States. It is obvious that the maintenance of slavery in Cuba would become impossible after the emancipation of the slaves in Porto Rico, and it would not be agreeable to the advocates of American aggression to be deprived of a pretext for the prevention of their designs. Mr. Fish has, probably of set purpose, furnished all the malcontent Spanish factions with an argument against emancipation which will be, of all other reasons, the most popular and effective; and if the Bill is consequently lost, and the Ministry driven from office, it will become the painful duty of General SICKLES to remonstrate in still stronger language against the obstinate maintenance of slavery in the Spanish colonies. As there happens to be no insurrection in Porto Rico, complaints of the difficulty and hardship of preserving neutrality will only apply to Cuba; but "delay of emancipation and other reforms" can be alleged

as a reason for seizing any Spanish island which may attract American cupidity. ZORRILLA perhaps thought that his Porto Rico Bill would to a certain extent satisfy American exigency; but he is by this time aware that his project of emancipation has only precipitated the diplomatic conflict. When the Empress CATHERINE had resolved on the partition of Poland, she vigorously opposed the efforts of Polish patriots to reform the obsolete institutions which furnished an excuse for her interference. The American PRESIDENT cannot openly avow his objection to the emancipation of slaves in Porto Rico; but his SECRETARY OF STATE, with a watchfulness severely strained, interposes every possible difficulty in the way of abolition.

American projects for the acquisition of Cuba have the questionable merit of consistency. Seventeen or eighteen years have passed since the American representatives at the Western Courts of Europe met at Ostend with the sanction of their Government for the purpose of concocting a strange declaration that the possession of Cuba was indispensable to the security of the United States. One of their number, Mr. BUCHANAN, having been soon afterwards elected President, formally recommended to Congress in his first Message the acquisition of Cuba. The professed object of the American Government was not at that time to promote emancipation, but to insure the continuance of slavery, and to strengthen the institution in the South. The supplementary reasons for taking the property of others vary with changing circumstances; while the transfer of possession from the weaker to the stronger claimant is a common element in the process of spoliation. If the Spanish Government had possessed sufficient wisdom and vigour to abolish slavery in Cuba immediately after the adoption of the principle by the Cortes, Mr. FISH would have been compelled to devise some less plausible argument for his menace of interference; but it is idle to suppose that ambitious designs can be thwarted by the withdrawal of colourable pretexts for aggression. Two or three years ago the PRESIDENT, in spite of domestic opposition, long and obstinately prosecuted a scheme for the annexation of the independent territory of San Domingo; and the announcement that an American Company has obtained a lease of the harbour of Samana seems to imply that the project is revived. There was no slavery in San Domingo; and if there were civil or foreign wars, it was not alleged that the watchfulness of the American Government was severely strained to preserve neutrality; but San Domingo contained rich lands and useful harbours; and Cuba is larger, richer, and better adapted to maritime intercourse than San Domingo. When Cuba has become a part of the United States, no long period will elapse before it is discovered that the English West Indies ought in turn to be annexed to Cuba. It cannot indeed well be alleged that emancipation, in which England preceded America by thirty years, has been unduly delayed; but some successor of Mr. FISH will perhaps demand other reforms in Jamaica; and if England should unhappily become as powerless as Spain, it will become a question whether "the duty of the United States Government to itself and to the commercial interests of its citizens may not demand a change in the line of action hitherto pursued."

The Republican majority in the American Senate will probably not be inclined to oppose the PRESIDENT's aggressive policy. Mr. SUMNER, who took a principal part in resisting the annexation of San Domingo, has, by his own fault, lost the considerable influence which he once possessed; and perhaps, even if he were still Chairman of Foreign Affairs, he might not oppose a scheme by which emancipation would be accelerated. The most judicious American politicians disapprove on sufficient grounds of the extension of the Republic into regions inhabited by inferior or alien races. The Spaniards, the creoles, and the negroes of Cuba would not furnish a desirable addition to the roll of American citizens. It is sufficiently embarrassing to be troubled with WARMOTH and PINCHBECK elections in Louisiana, and with contests between negroes and Northern adventurers in Alabama or South Carolina. The nomination at Havannah of United States Senators would probably not be an edifying proceeding. It is already known from the speeches of Señor ZORRILLA that the Spanish Government cannot have complied with the express or implied demands of the United States; nor is it easy to foresee the next stage in the controversy. The PRESIDENT and Senate can scarcely issue a declaration of war in the absence of all provocation, and if they wish to recognize the insurgent Government, they will first have to create it; but when the wolf and the lamb come together, grounds of quarrel may always be found. A refusal to allow the seizure by Spanish cruisers of American vessels

conveying cargoes for the use of the insurgents would speedily provoke a collision, and if hostilities once begin the conquest of Cuba is inevitable. The marvellous invention of arbitration which still excites the admiration of some English philanthropists will scarcely be applicable to a war undertaken for the sole purpose of annexing foreign territory. Even a Geneva Tribunal could scarcely award the possession of Cuba to the United States on any of the pretexts which are alleged by Mr. FISH; nor would the Spanish Government agree to be bound by retrospective rules to the effect that islands belonged to the rulers of the neighbouring continent. Mr. FISH may find numerous precedents, not in international law, but in the diplomacy of superior force. The despatches of NAPOLEON when he intended to seize Naples, or Tuscany, or Hamburg, are framed on the same principles which are reproduced in General SICKLE'S demands.

RECENT POLITICAL SPEECHES.

THE reassembling of Parliament will soon put to silence most members of Parliament. It is natural, therefore, that many members should be making what little hay they can while the sun of the vacation is still shining, and that the columns of the daily papers should be full of the utterances of members to their constituents. Through almost all of them there runs the same complete absence of matter. The speakers have to make their bricks, but no one will give them any straw. There are two reasons for this; the first being the want of any strictly party question; and the other, the fear felt by the speakers lest they should commit themselves by expressing an opinion on subjects too big for them. Irish Education and Local Taxation are expected to be the two principal themes of debate next Session; but there is no speaker addressing any constituency, or of any party, who ventures to tread on such dangerous ground. Accordingly the tendency is strong to talk mere platitudes, and to debate for ever such vague and useless questions as whether reform means revolution or progress. The truth is that at the present moment there is no difference whatever between the political position of the mass of Liberal members and that of the mass of Conservative members. Mr. CHILDESS spoke at Pontefract last Monday, and cited the Conservative member for King's Lynn to show that when a nation is said to want rest, all that may be meant is that it should quietly persevere in the good course on which it has entered. This is all very proper, but how is a Liberal to be distinguished from a Conservative by the use of such phrases? Party men cannot separate themselves from each other except by having points of difference, yet now party men talk the same language. The Conservative wishes to uphold that which exists, including the disestablished Irish Church, the sacrificed Irish landlord, and vote by Ballot. So does the Liberal. Each year the Conservative point of view changes, for it approves of or accepts all the measures the Liberals have carried. Thus at the end of a Session the parties are on the same platform. But the Conservative says that the measures which the Liberal is likely to propose in the next Session are sure to be dangerous, while the Liberal says they are sure to be excellent. This might create a real divergence of opinion if it were but known what the forthcoming measures were to be. But no one knows, or pretends to know, or even pretends to care to know. They will be measures relating to those two dangerous and mysterious subjects, Local Taxation and Irish Education; and to most members of Parliament these subjects are as strange and as distasteful as the politics of Central Asia. Both parties keep aloof from them; and the same may be said of what is called the Land Question. There really is no such thing as a definite Land Question; but it seems to speakers who follow one another like a flock of sheep that somehow there ought to be. When they come to think what they have to say about land, they can remember nothing but that the transfer of land ought to be facilitated, and perhaps that the law of intestate succession with regard to land should be altered. This is the whole of the Land Question as it appears to the ordinary member, although it does not seem half so big to him as he feels it ought to do. Directly persons who talk of the Land Question go further, they either proceed to discuss matters which do not affect land more than any other kind of property, such as what is called the Law of Entail, or they wander into dreams of Socialism. But within the tiny range of the facilitation of the transfer of land, and of an alteration in the law of intestate succession, there is no room for party feeling or for any great party differences. The people whom the proposed reforms would principally affect are the

solicitors, and solicitors when threatened forget and make up party differences. All that the ordinary member feels on the subject is that if a new system of land transfer is instituted, he should like the credit of it, if it is a success, to be laid to his party, and the discredit of it, if it is a failure, to be laid to the other party; but as he is utterly unable to judge whether it is likely to be a success or not, he prudently holds his tongue as to details, and wisely pronounces that he is for a good sound measure on this most important point.

There is not the slightest blame to be attached to members because in such a state of things they make speeches which are necessarily dull and tame. Mr. CHILDESS is a man of ability, and if he talked a series of platitudes for a couple of hours, lesser men need not be ashamed of doing no better. But to say nothing is distasteful to men of some activity of mind, and some of the more adventurous members have tried to find a field in discussing the principle of applying arbitration to the settlement of international differences. Liberal members are especially given to this, and they are fond of proclaiming that this reference to arbitration is a grand Anglo-Saxon discovery, and of boasting that the two divisions of the race have given an example to the world. Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE has devoted a whole speech to the subject, and he evidently did not speak without having bestowed some thought on it. He has gone so far as to discover that arbitration could not have prevented any of the wars which have taken place in this generation. It could not, he owned, have prevented the Crimean war, or the Italian war of 1859, or the German and French war. This seems a very sober and rational view of the matter, but it is a sad limitation to the efficacy of the new discovery. It appears that before it was revealed as the gift of Anglo-Saxons to the world, the wars that might have happened, but did not happen, were prevented without it; and that it could have done nothing to prevent those wars which actually took place. The only case in which it is even supposed by those who most admire it to be applicable is to prevent a war between nations who do not wish to fight. There are only two nations in constant danger, really or apparently, of a collision, and yet who are both averse to a war with each other—England and the United States; and the Anglo-Saxon discovery is therefore, so far as can be seen at present, exclusively beneficial to those who are called Anglo-Saxons. It is a means of avoiding war with America. The question is whether it is a good way, and the answer seems to be that it is a good way within the limits in which arbitration has always been recognized as useful, and no further. Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE set out by saying that he was always of opinion that England was wrong with regard to the *Alabama*, and was bound to make compensation for her misdeeds. This view, if the right one, would have made things very simple. We should only have had to acknowledge that we had been wrong, and settle the amount to be paid. If we could not have agreed as to the amount, this would have been exactly a point which we might have referred to some outside Power or person to decide for us. As it was, we attained a simple end by the most round-about process possible, and had to submit ourselves to endless humiliation to arrive at it. Every one is glad to have avoided a war with America on a point of very minor importance; no one minds paying the money which the Arbitrators have decided we should pay. But the Conservative leaders have an opportunity which, if they are fit to govern the country, they should not lose, of reviewing the history of the *Alabama* negotiations, treaty, and award, in order not to attack the Ministry or to quarrel with the general result, but to guide the future policy of the country whenever difficulties of a similar kind arise.

As the bulk of Ministerialist and Opposition speakers have nothing to say, it is natural to turn to more extreme men to learn what is going on in circles where greater excitement prevails. Chelsea is the chosen home of Radicalism, and the members for Chelsea have been this week addressing their constituents. But those will be disappointed who expect to learn much from the speeches of the Chelsea members. The reporter described Sir HENRY HOARE's speech by saying that he touched lightly on several topics, and no description could have been more exact. He is the butterfly of Radicalism, and no sooner has he settled on a flower than he is off again. "You could not answer argument by a joke," he informed his admirers, "but the Income-tax was the only tax of which a man wished he paid a larger proportion; yet it was inquisitorial and vexatious." The butterfly was soon off again, and flew to the Game-laws, which he wished to see largely

modified, but he did not want to see birds exterminated. Conservatives who are alarmed at Radicalism of this type must be very easily frightened. Sir CHARLES DILKE was of course more serious, but he evidently spoke without having taken the pains to exhaust any of the subjects of his Radical manifesto. He was opposed both to direct and to indirect taxation. He wished all indirect taxes of every kind to be removed, and at the same time he was dead against the Income-tax. On the other hand, he was for reducing the public expenditure, principally by giving up Gibraltar, which he declared would save the country a million a year. Radicals of this stamp will not, we may be sure, do much harm to any one. If any Conservatives are inclined to shudder at the proposals of such speakers, they should call to mind the very different way in which Mr. BRIGHT went to work when he led an Opposition which was really formidable. He knew his own mind; he selected a special point, worked out thoroughly what he had to say on it, and drove his points home with the full powers of rhetoric and exaggeration at his command. So long as Radicals set about their business in exactly the opposite way, make very large proposals for changes with regard to law, or property, or finance, while they avoid details and show no mastery of the elements of their subjects, the country is sure to rate them at their proper value; and the tiny pebbles they throw into the calm waters of current politics soon sink to the bottom, leaving the surface as unruled as before.

M. THIERS AND THE THIRTY.

THE Committee of Thirty have marked out the limits within which the constitutional controversy is for the present to be confined. The Bill prepared by the Second Sub-Committee, and another prepared by M. TALLON, are to form the text of discussion, and at the meeting of the Committee on Tuesday M. THIERS contributed a preparatory criticism of the principal provisions of the two drafts. These relate to the creation of a Second Chamber, and the relations between the President and the Assembly. The Bill prepared by the Sub-Committee places the creation of a Second Chamber last in order; M. TALLON's Bill places it first. M. THIERS holds that in point of importance it ought to take precedence, but declares himself willing to debate it either first or last. In both drafts the Second Chamber is treated rather as an element in a future Constitution than as an addition to the existing one. The third article proposed by the Sub-Committee provides that after the separation of the National Assembly the legislative power shall be exercised by two Chambers. M. TALLON's Bill enacts that in the month which shall precede the date finally fixed for the separation, the Assembly shall provide for the nomination of an Upper Chamber and determine the mode of nomination, the duration and character of its powers, and its relations both to the Executive and to the new Assembly. As regards the relations between the Assembly and the President, the Sub-Committee propose that he shall ordinarily communicate with the Chamber by message. But the purport of his message may be to announce that he thinks it necessary to take part in a debate, in which case the discussion to which the message refers shall be suspended till the next day. As soon as the President has spoken, the discussion is to be again suspended, and he is on no account to be present when the Chamber goes to a division. Laws for which urgency has been voted must be promulgated by the President within three days of their adoption by the Assembly, unless he, during this interval, sends a message demanding a fresh debate on them. In the case of ordinary laws he may demand after the second reading that the third reading shall be put off for a month. M. TALLON's scheme allows the President to take part in debates without the formality of a previous message, but provides that a vote shall not be taken at the same sitting, and that the President shall not be present at the division. No special provision is made in this draft for laws for which urgency has been voted. The President is to have a general suspensive veto upon all resolutions adopted by the Assembly. When this is exercised the Chamber will proceed to a fresh discussion in the ordinary course.

M. THIERS has shown himself wonderfully pliable in the presence of these two proposals. He is quite contented to postpone the creation of a Second Chamber until the close of the Assembly's term, but he pleads for two months of preparation instead of one, and for the substitution of the word "election" for the word "nomination." As regards the relations of the President to the Assembly, he decidedly prefers

M. TALLON's plan, though he expressly says that he can, if necessary, accept the Sub-Committee's plan. Thereupon, however, with an irony not perhaps quite unintentional, he devotes the rest of his speech to an exposition of the inconveniences which will certainly follow from the adoption of either. The result of obliging the President to retire from the Assembly immediately he has spoken will be to cause many delays. Some of the most important debates arise out of amendments proposed perhaps after the President will have left. He will thus be forced to send a second or third message announcing his intention to speak, and each time the Assembly will have to put off coming to a decision. Where questions of importance are concerned no Minister can take the place of the President, so that if even a single statement is made in debate which the President wishes to contradict, the whole machinery of a message and an adjournment must be called into play. Besides this there are some subjects upon which it is not enough for the President to make a set speech. What is wanted is such constant explanation as can be given in the course of a debate and in no other way. It is of little use for the President to speak if he must leave the Chamber without hearing and answering the criticism of which he will be the object as soon as his back is turned. If the Committee insist that the Assembly shall do nothing when the President is present, except listen to a formal argument, they will make discussion impossible. It will be for them to consider whether in making discussion impossible they will not make Parliamentary government impossible. Still, even if they push matters to this length, M. THIERS will not utterly break with them. He is so anxious to come to terms that he is willing to make many sacrifices.

In the matter of the veto M. THIERS insists on the necessity of the President being in a position to neutralize the ill effects of any sudden excitement on the part of the Assembly. The Committee on the Army Bill, for example, began by being convinced that the Prussian military organization must be imported into France, and ended by being convinced of almost the exact contrary. This process of conversion occupied a year; and, supposing the Assembly to be equally carried away by some mistaken idea, there would be the same need of time for it to come back to a sounder mind. For this purpose a delay of a month is not sufficient; there ought to be an interval of at least three months after the President has vetoed a Bill before a fresh discussion on it can begin. There must be time for the Assembly to learn the opinions of the press and of the provinces—opinions the wisdom of which M. THIERS declares that he daily has cause to appreciate—and to modify its conclusions in conformity with them.

In subjecting the proposals which the Committee are about to consider to this exceedingly frank criticism M. THIERS has probably had two objects in view. One of these is the conversion of a majority of the Committee. Anxious as the Right has shown itself to banish the PRESIDENT from the Tribune—an anxiety it must be remembered in part excused by the undue pressure he has occasionally brought to bear on the Assembly—the inconveniences of the compromise now suggested are too serious not to cause some hesitation on the part of those who meditate encountering them. The animus of a section of the Sub-Committee is shown by the fact that two of the members propose that the right of demanding a fresh discussion shall not be given to the President except when he has not spoken in the Chamber, and that the right of speaking in the Chamber shall not be given to him in debates on interpellations. M. THIERS pointed out that it is in cases of the greatest moment that the President will most desire to take part in the debate, and it is in cases where he has taken part in the debate without bringing the Assembly round to his opinion that he will most desire to delay the execution of its decision. The object of this limitation, therefore, would be to tie one or other of the President's hands at the very time when it is most important that he should have the use of both. The object of the second limitation is to make the tribune little better than useless to the President, under cover of giving him access to it. In a political point of view the discussions that arise out of interpellations are almost always of a graver character than those which arise out of Bills. The really pressing questions, whether of foreign or of home policy, are ordinarily started in this way, and to enact that the President shall express no opinion on them is virtually to exclude him from public affairs. But though there are members of the Committee willing to go this length, it does not follow that they constitute a majority of the Thirty, or that even those who do go this length may not be shaken in their determination by M.

THIERS's reasoning. If there is any chance of the Committee's being influenced in the direction he wishes to lead it, the long discussion in which M. THIERS proposes to involve the members will give him every opportunity of making that chance a certainty. At all events he can hardly fail to secure his second object, which is to make an impression on the Assembly. Supposing the Committee to reject the modifications suggested by M. THIERS, the attitude of the Government, and the reasons which have led it to assume that attitude, will be known as soon as their Report is read. M. THIERS will, in effect, have secured the right of reply, because the speeches in defence of the Report will necessarily take the shape of a comment on the speeches which he has delivered before the Committee. By this means, too, the Government will have had time to press its views upon influential deputies, and to profit by expressions of opinion "in the press and in the provinces" before the discussion begins. M. THIERS's talent for Parliamentary finesse promises to stand him in good stead.

MR. MORLEY'S COMPROMISE.

THERE are signs that at the eleventh hour of the Parliamentary recess the Education League is beginning to see the difficulties which lie in the way of an unconditional repeal of the 25th Clause of the Education Act. In a speech delivered at Bristol on Wednesday, Mr. SAMUEL MORLEY admitted that, supposing the demand for repeal to be granted, it would become imperative that some means should be found of meeting the difficulty which the clause in question had been designed to meet. This is the first word, so far as we know, that any member of the League has said on the subject, which involves a recognition that new schools have to be paid for. Hitherto the programme of the League has been characterized by a simple trust in the willingness of the British ratepayer to put his hand in his purse which seems hardly justified by experience. The Government have been abused for their obstinacy in maintaining Denominational schools as an integral part of the educational machinery of the country, without any allowance being made for the possible difficulty of providing any other machinery to fill their place. The provision of a Board school in every district has been treated as the most matter of course thing in the world. It has been assumed that the excision of a word or two from the Education Act would do all that is wanted, that when the need for Board schools is created by virtue of there being indigent children to be sent to them, the schools themselves will arise as if by magic. We have again and again pointed out the unsoundness of this expectation. That a wonderful moral impulse is occasionally communicated to whole communities at once is shown by the example of the Crusades; but if the ratepayers come forward as soon as the 25th Clause is out of the way and build a School Board school wherever there is a parent who cannot afford to pay the school fee, Mr. DIXON will have proved himself a greater preacher than PETER the HERMIT. Mr. MORLEY, or, more accurately, the authors of the paper of which Mr. MORLEY made himself the exponent, are evidently beginning to feel uneasy lest the miracle which is to make stingy men liberal and poor men careless about money should not come off after all. It is a real advance to admit that the 25th Clause was designed to meet a difficulty. The common view among members of the League has hitherto been that it was inserted in the Bill out of malice aforesight. Mr. FORSTER saw his opportunity of injuring the Dissenters, and the temptation to betray his old friends was too strong to be resisted. The crime was all the more attractive because it was absolutely unnecessary. There is some significance in the choice of Mr. MORLEY as one of the four persons who should draw up the statement of the concessions which the League have made up their minds to insist on. He is not among those who would refuse Mr. FORSTER any place for repentence. Indeed he confesses that when the Education Act was under discussion he thought better of it than most of his friends did. He has seen the error of his way since then, but still he is a late convert, and if the fatted calf has been killed in his behalf, a share of it may still be reserved for Mr. FORSTER. A spirit of compromise is so valuable an element in educational controversy that we are ready to welcome the slightest evidence of its presence, and for this reason, if for no other, Mr. MORLEY's proposal deserves careful consideration.

The difficulty he has to meet is this:—Given a district in which sufficient school accommodation is furnished by Denominational schools, and a child whose parent is unable to pay the school fee; how, when compulsion has once been made

universal, is this child's schooling to be provided? So long as the 25th Clause remains and is acted upon, everything goes smoothly. The parent sends his child to the Denominational school which he likes best, and the School Board pays the fee. But if the 25th Clause is repealed, the School Board will have no power to pay the fee in a Denominational school. As regards this one child there will be an educational famine in the midst of educational plenty. Hitherto the expedient proposed by the League has been the building of a school supported out of the rates and controlled by the School Board for the exclusive use and benefit of this solitary infant. It may be admitted that there is something grand in an adherence to principle which prefers to incur an outlay of some hundreds of pounds rather than pay threepence a week to a Denominational schoolmaster for teaching a child the three R's. But ratepayers for the most part do not belong to the heroic order. They are more likely to dwell on the fact that for threepence a week the child can be educated just as effectually as for an expenditure of many hundred times that amount. The triumph of religious equality might be secured by the child remaining away from school altogether, but the Education League exists for other purposes as well as for the propagation of Mr. MIALL's theories; and this reflection has probably been instrumental in quickening the inventiveness of Mr. MORLEY and his friends. He sees that the ratepayers in the vast majority of cases would steadily refuse to build a school under the circumstances supposed, and that it would be utterly impossible to pass or work an Act of Parliament ordering them to build one. Accordingly, he suggests that wherever sufficient school accommodation is provided by Denominational schools in any school district, the School Board shall be the manager of one or more of these schools for the purpose of controlling them during the hours of secular instruction, the building to be retained for all other purposes, and at all other times, by the existing management. When this compromise is found to be impracticable, then, and then only, the School Board shall be bound to provide a new school. We have no wish to speak disrespectfully of any honest effort to devise a settlement of what is undoubtedly a serious educational difficulty. But if Mr. MORLEY will only think the matter out, he will see that there is something undignified in appealing to Denominational school managers to help him in injuring—or at all events in doing what is intended to injure—Denominational schools. We cannot possibly—he makes the School Board say—pay you for educating the children whom the law obliges us to educate. But if you will be kind enough to hand over your school to us for a certain number of hours every day, we will undertake to educate them at your expense. It is pretty safe to assume that, except in cases where the Denominational school is already on its last legs, or where the managers hold the sound but unusual view that secular instruction may be disjoined from religious instruction without any harm being done to Denominational teaching, this offer will be declined as something not much better than an insult. Mr. MORLEY perhaps hopes that the School Board will then be able to persuade the ratepayers to build a school, on the plea that the necessity arises from the perverseness and obstinacy of the Denominationalists. It is more probable that they will ask why children cannot be sent to the Denominational school for the purposes of secular instruction, and the intervention of the School Board confined to ensuring that they enjoy the full protection of the Conscience Clause.

Supposing, however, that the School Board finds some Denominational school willing to come in to its terms, or persuades the ratepayers to provide a school in which indigent children may be taught without suspicion of Denominational contamination, another difficulty may still remain. Mr. MORLEY proposes that school districts shall be enlarged—apparently for the purpose of having a wider choice of Denominational schools to work upon, and an increased area from which to raise money if it has to be raised. The result of this change will be to increase the inconvenience—which would certainly be felt in many cases even if the districts remain as they are—of children being compelled to pass the door of a school giving efficient instruction in order to go to a more distant school giving perhaps less efficient instruction. In a district containing half-a-dozen Denominational schools, one situated perhaps in a remote corner accepts the offer of the School Board. Thereupon the child of an indigent parent living in an opposite corner has to be taken away from another Denominational school with which his parent is perfectly satisfied, and made to walk six or eight miles a day in order to keep the principle of religious equality absolutely inviolate. If compulsion can be worked

with this needless irritant superadded to those which unavoidably attach to it, English parents will show themselves unexpectedly patient of theoretical legislation.

UNIONISTS IN CONGRESS.

WHAT is called a Trades' Congress has this week been held at Leeds. It is composed of "delegates and members"; but the difference between a delegate and a member is not very clear. We gather from a complaint which has been made that these Congresses have not altogether fulfilled the object for which they were originally established. That object seems to have been to advertise the so-called working-men who have given up work and are now engaged in professionally representing the working classes in various forms of political agitation. Last year, however, several members of Parliament contrived to get admitted to the Congress and made speeches, which the reporters, with a shocking want of discrimination, sent to their respective journals instead of the speeches of the agitators. This abuse is now to be put a stop to, and henceforth nobody is to be invited to any of these gatherings whose oratory is likely to eclipse that of the "delegates and members." Perhaps it is just as well that we should have the plain and unalloyed opinions of the gentlemen who direct the operations of the Trade Unions on some of the questions which are just now engaging so much attention. Before we look at the arguments of the Congress, it will be desirable to examine its facts. The Report of the Council rejoices over the "victory" of the Newcastle engineers, and the establishment of the nine hours' day, and also speaks of the results of the bricklayers' and bakers' strikes in London, as if these, too, had been successful. In point of fact the engineers were not victorious, inasmuch as they were glad at the end of several months to accept the terms which were offered by their employers almost at the outset of the strike. Nor has the nine hours' working-day, in the sense in which it was demanded by the men, been established at Newcastle or anywhere else. What the engineers sought was a limitation of production; what they got was only an increase of wages. They wanted to put a stop to overtime altogether, and failed; all that was conceded was that overtime should begin to be reckoned earlier in the day than formerly, and this they could have had for the asking without a strike at all. The compromise which brought the bricklayers' strike to an end might also have been secured without an open rupture; and the bakers' strike, as everybody knows, was a failure. The report of the Congress does not appear to have contained any censure on the gas-stokers for their violation of law and reckless disregard of public interests, but several of the speakers denounced in vehement language the "cruelty and vindictiveness" of the judge who tried the ringleaders. These are rhetorical expressions which may be usefully omitted from the discussion of the question. There is a very general impression, which we certainly share, that the sentence was too severe. A year's imprisonment is a very serious thing for a working-man who has a wife and family dependent on his labour, and a more lenient sentence might have satisfied the interests of justice. The feeling on this subject is, as far as we can judge, so strong and unanimous, even among those least disposed to sympathize with or to favour the policy of the Trade Unions, that the HOME SECRETARY might not unreasonably exercise the Royal prerogative in favour of the prisoners. The question is not a very difficult or complicated one, and there has been plenty of time even for Mr. BRUCE to make up his mind upon it. It is not desirable that the decision of the Crown on such a matter should have the slightest appearance of being due to any kind of coercion; and we cannot help thinking that the HOME SECRETARY should at once have considered the matter, and have come to some decision upon it. Whatever is done in such a case should be done as the result of a calm and deliberate conviction on the part of the Minister, and on his own responsibility, and not in obedience to clamour and intimidation.

Whatever may be thought of the severity of the sentence which was passed on the gas-stokers, there cannot be the slightest doubt that they committed a criminal act. Mr. LISHMAN, the President of the Congress, observed that "Trade Unionists had little idea that, under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, for the offence of leaving work without notice they could be convicted of conspiracy." If Trade Unionists had no idea of this, it is rather important that it should be brought home to their minds. Mr. LISHMAN also said that "the time had gone by for special laws against Trade

"Unionists, and that there was no reason why they should not come under the common law of the land"; and we fully agree with the remark. On the other hand, however, Unionists must not expect to be exempted from the operation of the common law of the land merely because it does not happen to suit their projects. Mr. Justice BRETT's judgment, as reported, is not quite so clear as could be wished, but it is impossible to say whether this is the fault of the Judge or of the reporters. He is said to have laid it down that "a combination to do anything to cause annoyance, or in the way of unjustifiable interference which in the judgment of the jury would have the effect of annoying or interfering with the minds of ordinary persons carrying on such a business as that of a gas company," was a conspiracy; but "unjustifiable interference" is a phrase which begs the whole question. What is unjustifiable interference? It is obvious that, even if notice were given in a regular way, a strike, or the threat of a strike, would have the effect of annoying or interfering with the minds of ordinary persons carrying on business. If that is a criminal conspiracy, we can only say that society is honeycombed with conspiracies. It is quite clear, for example, that the Civil Service Stores are combinations which annoy and interfere with the minds of ordinary persons engaged in the sale of groceries, and the directors, on this reading of the law, are each liable to a year's imprisonment. All kinds of manufacturers and salesmen combine for the purpose of regulating their respective trades, and especially of keeping up prices, and should therefore be prosecuted. When employers give notice of a reduction of wages, they annoy and interfere with the minds of their men just as much as the men annoy and interfere with the minds of the masters when they threaten to strike.

We are bound to suppose that when Mr. Justice BRETT spoke of unjustifiable interference he was thinking of some criminal act; and to leave work without notice, in breach of an engagement, is undoubtedly a criminal offence. There appears to be a good deal of misapprehension both as to the scope of the Trade Unions' Act and the Criminal Law relating to Violence Act, and as to the nature of the law of conspiracy. The Acts we have mentioned were passed only for the purpose of eliminating "restraint of trade" as an element of criminality. It may be assumed that it was intended to make strikes legal, and a combination to strike, supposing the strike to be conducted in a regular and peaceful manner, would therefore be removed from the category of criminal conspiracies. But the general law of conspiracy is still applicable to Unionists just the same as to non-Unionists; and whatever may be doubtful as to the law of conspiracy, it is at least certain that a conspiracy to commit a crime is a crime. It seems to have been somewhat hastily assumed that Mr. Justice BRETT was not entitled to take into account the injury to the public resulting from the misconduct of the gas-stokers. If the strike had been a regular and legal strike, the stokers could not have been held responsible for any inconvenience or injury to the public. It is absurd to say that any class of men are bound to go on working for an indefinite period at a rate of wages which they consider insufficient, simply because their leaving off work would be annoying to the public. The public has no more right to compel men to work for it against their will than any private employer. On the other hand, however, when a crime has been committed, the judge in passing sentence is not only entitled, but bound, to look at the actual and possible consequences of the crime. A strike of bricklayers without notice would be a crime, but its consequences would not go beyond a certain amount of loss to the builders, and of inconvenience to persons who might be waiting for houses. It is obvious that a strike of railway signalmen without notice in the middle of the night would be a crime of more serious magnitude. It might lead to the destruction of a vast amount of valuable property and of thousands of lives. The gas-stokers not only did not care whether the inhabitants of London suffered from their sudden desertion of their posts, but desired and intended that they should suffer, and deliberately doomed them to their fate in order that it might be the means of influencing the Gas Companies. As it happened, the stokers were disappointed, but their intentions unquestionably aggravated their crime.

The temper of the Congress was sufficiently indicated by the uproar which was produced by the President's innocent remark that, in his opinion, some of the strikes which had recently occurred were inopportune and injudicious. The observation was received with indignant cries, and the President was severely rebuked for his scepticism and pro-

fanity. It would appear that, in the opinion of the Congress, strikes are part of the sacred rites of the industrial religion, and that there is a peculiar sanctity about them which places them beyond the reach of criticism. It might have been supposed that the interests of working-men depend a good deal upon whether their strikes are opportune and judicious or the reverse, and that a friend could hardly do them a greater service than by warning them against rash and unprofitable movements of this kind. But then to hint that a strike could under any possible circumstances be injurious would be a reflection on those who arrange and direct such things, and this happens to be the very class represented at the Congress. Nobody denies that the men of any trade have a right to strike if they choose, but it does not follow that by striking they invariably promote their own interests. It is doubtful whether strikes have had the effect of raising the rates of wages; indeed there is some reason to believe that they have tended to retard the advance of wages which was gradually taking place through other causes. However that may be, it is tolerably certain that, when the loss of wages to the men and the loss of capital to the trade are fairly reckoned up, even an apparently successful strike will be found in the end to be a losing game. In the present strike of colliers in South Wales, some of the Unionists have been using their influence to induce the men in charge of the pumping-engines in the mines to withdraw. If the engines were stopped, the pits would quickly be flooded. The result would be that, when the strike was over, several months would elapse before the men could begin to earn wages, and the expense of getting the water out of the mines would of course be so much deducted from the fund at the disposal of the proprietors for paying wages and carrying on their business. Nothing was said at the Congress to show that the managers of the Unions have recovered from the delusion that whatever injures the masters must necessarily be a proportionate benefit to the men. A good deal of nonsense is daily talked and written in regard to arbitration between employers and their men. Arbitration is possible only when the quarrel has been reduced to an issue of facts, and it is probable that when this stage of the controversy has been reached arbitration will be found to be superfluous. It is evident that in South Wales the only question is which side is the stronger and has the greater capacity for endurance. The history of arbitration shows clearly enough that neither masters nor men will long submit to an adverse decision if they think they can gain anything by renewing the contest.

BYRON AND HIS WORSHIPPERS.

A CURIOUS controversy has recently sprung up in the *Times*, as to the accuracy of a well-known line in *Childe Harold*. More than fifty years have elapsed since the publication of the last canto of that poem, and during that time many thousands of readers must have learnt by heart the address to the Ocean, and many hundreds at least have been shocked by the ungrammatical substitution of "lay" for "lie." It is rather odd, therefore, that the reading should now be undergoing a discussion as animated as though the flaw had just been discovered in Mr. Tennyson's last poem. It is yet more surprising to find that there are still many persons who, not content with admiring the magnificent vigour of Byron's poetry, insist upon believing that it is absolutely free from faults. One class of enthusiasts holds that "lay," being obviously a vulgarism, cannot have been written by Byron. The various readings which have been suggested are so obviously feeble, however, that this mode of escaping the difficulty does not deserve any serious notice. Mr. Murray's statement as to the authority of the MS. is conclusive; and none of the verbs which can be substituted for "lay" have any merit beyond that of being intransitive. Another class admits that Byron made a mistake, but regards it as wrong to dwell upon it. One of these gentlemen quotes a phrase from *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*:

"But hold!" exclaims a friend, "here's some neglect;
This—that—and t'other line seem incorrect."
What then? The selfsame blunder Pope has got;
And careless Dryden—"Ay, but Pye has not."
Indeed!—tis granted, faith! but what care I?
Bette to err with Pope than shine with Pye.

This is all very well; but it does not meet the case. Neither Pope nor Dryden, as far as we can remember, though we cannot pledge ourselves to maintain the negative, has made this particular blunder. Pope, indeed, not unfrequently falls into grammatical errors from an excessive love of compression; and it may be—for upon that subject we must admit our entire ignorance—that Pye does not. But then there is no necessity for "erring with Pope" because you do not "shine with Pye." The argument would be effective only as against critics who should maintain that Byron was inferior to Pye because he had fallen into blunders from which Pye is free; and nobody, as far as we know, has said anything so silly. Whatever may be Byron's

merits, they surely should not blind us to his faults. He can't have faults! replies a still more enthusiastic writer. Byron is by far the greatest of English poets since Milton; and therefore we should humbly submit to any vulgarism or grammatical solecism of which he may be guilty. Byron must be regarded as an infallible being who is "super grammaticam." As the captain of a ship "makes it" twelve o'clock, so Byron's language must be taken not as recognizing, but as constituting, the law. We do not know, indeed, whether this privilege is limited to Byron himself, or whether a usage once consecrated by him is supposed to become henceforward part of the language. The extreme of fanaticism would be reached by the admirer who should continue piously to commit the same blunder as the god of his idolatry. If everybody who misplaced words could take refuge under the plea of Byron-worship, the sect would be painfully numerous. It is to be hoped, however, that the admirers of popular authors will show their enthusiasm in some other way than by barbarously mutilating their mother tongue. Precedents can be quoted from widely read books for nearly every pestilent misuse of language which is current amongst us. To take an obvious instance, Dickens did much towards hopelessly confounding the prevalent confusion between "mutual" and "common," when, in spite of protest, he insisted upon giving to his novel the title of *Our Mutual Friend*. There is always a tendency towards degeneration through the inability of the careless and ignorant to recognize the finer distinctions between nearly synonymous words, and persons who are capable of better things should do their best to resist any authority, however venerable, under cover of which attempts are made to obliterate shades of meaning. A wilful blindness to the errors of Byron, even if it does not involve the condonation of similar errors in inferior writers, is to be condemned in the interests of poetry as well as in the interest of the language itself. A poet is an artist in words; and popular readers are not aware how greatly the charm of the most exquisite poetry depends upon a fine sense of proprieties of language which they consider as finical and pedantic. The misuse of a single word may destroy the charm of a passage as decidedly as a false note in music. It is the fly in the pot of ointment which poisons the sweetness of the sentiment; the little rift within the lute which introduces a jarring note, even when we are scarcely conscious of the cause of our annoyance. To what, for example, is owing the enduring charm of such an exquisite lyric as Herrick's "Gather ye rosebuds while ye may," or of Cowper's "Loss of the Royal George"? The sentiment in each of these poems is not only commonplace, but is delightful because commonplace. The beauty of them depends upon the expression in the simplest language of thoughts which are familiar to everybody. But of course it is not enough to express common thoughts in simple language, or Tate and Brady, to say nothing of Dr. Watts, would be great poets. The quality needed is an exquisite sense of propriety in the use of words, which is amongst the rarest of endowments; and which, where it exists gives a charm, as unspeakable as it is impossible of analysis to the utterance of a truism which in less skilful hands would strike us as trite and wearisome. To maintain a high standard of excellence in poetical workmanship is therefore the main service which criticism can render to poets; and more harm would be done by encouraging laxity in such matters than even by a grudging recognition of the merits which make us unwilling to admit the existence of faults.

The controversy, therefore, may be summed up very briefly. Byron has clearly injured a fine passage by a gross vulgarism, and it is a thousand pities that it cannot be excised. But it can neither be excised nor overlooked by a critic who is faithful to his duty, and we should not consent to sacrifice the language to the interests of a Byron or even of a Shakspeare. It is rather curious to discover that Byron should still have disciples ready to propose such a sacrifice. It might have been supposed that the Byron fever was over. No writer of anything like equal power ever committed so many poetical sins for the sake of temporary popularity, and Byron committed them with his eyes open. We need not dispute the statement that he is the greatest of our poets since Milton. Our judgment will probably depend upon the relative importance which we attribute to different poetical endowments. Nothing in Byron appeals to our deepest moral sentiments so forcibly as some of Wordsworth's odes and sonnets; nor is he ever so purely and ethereally poetical as Shelley in his loftier moods; but if sheer strength of human passion, finding expression in language of corresponding vigour, gives a man a title to the highest place in poetry, it must be admitted that Byron can put forward a very powerful claim in spite of all his affectations and his brutalities. We are never in favour, however, of arranging poets in order of merit as young gentlemen are being arranged just now in the Mathematical Tripos at Cambridge. We know of no satisfactory scale which will enable us to say, for example, that *Childe Harold* deserves 1,000 marks, and the *Excursion* 999 or 1,001. But, considering how conspicuously Byron's poetry is a mixture of strength and weakness, of ennobling and debasing passions, and how even in his loftiest passages there is perceptible a false note of affectation, we should have thought that the day of indiscriminating admiration ought to be over. In the very passage, for example, which has provoked this dispute, the use of the word "lay" is by no means the worst fault. The sense of the eternal and unchangeable character of the ocean is, indeed, given with admirable power, though we might raise objections to one or two

phrases. But when Byron gives a misanthropical turn to a reflection which is rather melancholy than terrible, he immediately becomes strained and unnatural. It is not a true antithesis to say that the ocean despises the vile strength which man wields for earth's destruction. Man cannot destroy the earth any more than he can destroy the sea; and the sea, so far from being a master who, whenever it pleases, send him howling and shivering to his gods in its playful spray, is in fact a very trustworthy servant. We feel that the poet is wilfully dwelling upon the destructive agency of the ocean, and wilfully turning away from its great advantages in a commercial point of view. The power of man is shown as much in shipbuilding as in building towns; and the ocean would not have been able to "mar the spoils of Trafalgar" if it had not been helped by the English cannon. It is not necessary that a poetical argument should be bound to logical forms; but in proportion as it is palpably distorted for rhetorical purposes it necessarily loses its effect. The same sense of incongruity pursues us throughout Byron's poetry, and makes us feel that it is not the utterance of the deepest emotions of humanity, but of sentiments distorted and perverted by the irregular passions of a nature stained by more than the average allowance of corruption.

Excessive idolatry of popular writers is indeed a common failing at the present day, and in one sense it may suggest some excuse for an exaggerated estimate of Byron's poetry. As a rule, the living idols are those who receive the most unmixed incense. There are two or three authors at the present day whose merits are undeniably great, and who may very possibly deserve most that is said of them even by indiscriminating worshippers. At the same time, no reputation is quite safe till it has survived the generation in which it arose and the school by which it was fostered. We may safely say that Pope was a great writer, because admiration for much of his work has remained in spite of his dethronement from poetical supremacy. But the all-swallowing devotion to modern writers is not only rash, in so far as it is premature, but it is almost certainly wrong in many points, because it insists upon overlooking the defects of its idols. We may say with considerable confidence that certain writers have obtained such a position that whatever they write is certain to be received with a chorus of adulation. There may be an undercurrent of disapproval gradually accumulating, and calculated, it may be, to produce an exaggerated explosion whenever it becomes safe to give it vent. But at present any hint that there are spots upon certain suns is received as a proof of the mean jealousy of the observer, and he is summarily ordered to hold his tongue. Poor Byron suffered in his day from excessive adulation and the recoil from adulation. By this time we might have hoped that a calmer judgment would have succeeded. It seems, however, that the zeal for his honour burns as brightly as ever in some bosoms, and one reason is that his fame is felt to provide a convenient counterpoise to the fame of the idols who are now most fashionable. To praise Byron is by implication to accuse certain modern writers of defects from which Byron was comparatively free. In fact, our modern school of poets is weak precisely where Byron was strong. With all his affectations and his weaknesses, he did not fall into the errors of namby-pambyism; and he at least made a protest—an exaggerated and brutal, but still a very effective, protest—against the adoration of mere prettiness, which is so fatal a defect of our most recent school of art. "There are chords in the human heart," said poor Mr. Guppy; and we may add that there are passions, though we frequently try to ignore the fact. Some of our poets seem to write for the benefit of young ladies, and to be ambitious chiefly to lie upon drawing-room tables; others seek to please small literary coteries, and lisp with affected simplicity in archaic costumes; and some who boast of shocking the proprieties only succeed in being indecent without showing the masculine vigour which alone can be a partial excuse for neglect of conventional decorum. Byron is the last of our poets who, with all his faults, can be said to have written for grown-up men, and to have made passion, instead of refined speculation, the motive power of his poetry. Perhaps it is natural that, when looking back to his writings from more sickly and academical performances, his merits should be unconsciously over-estimated. But, for all that, the sacred rules of truth forbid us to sanction the use of "lay" for "lie," whatever the ingenuity of the excuses put forward in its favour.

MR. HERBERT SPENCER'S REALISM AND BERKELEY.

IT is the commonest reproach of speculative intellect that it destroys more than it constructs. Whatever truth there may be in this in a general way, it is certain that the very opposite tendency is sometimes to be found in minds of great calibre. One such instance, we think, is now conspicuous amongst us in the person of Mr. Herbert Spencer. The constructive power shown in his works is unsurpassed in this generation. In deep and far-reaching insight, in co-ordinating seemingly scattered facts, and in harmonizing seemingly diverse results, he has no superior. But when he leaves the building up of his own ideas and goes about to demolish others which stand, or which he supposes to stand, in the way of his intended course, Mr. Spencer becomes a different person. As a constructive philosopher he is great; as a critic of philosophy he is liable to be even as other critics.

This duality or disproportion of Mr. Herbert Spencer's thought has perhaps never come out so clearly as in the lately issued

volume which completes the *Principles of Psychology*. In the part entitled "General Analysis" he examines the theory of knowledge, and in the course of that process he undertakes to confute idealism, which he thinks to be necessary in order to ensure the safety of his positive results. He chooses Berkeley's doctrine, or rather the not uncommon misconception of Berkeley's doctrine, as a sort of representative enemy, and spends some time in attacking it in detail. It is fortunate that Mr. J. S. Mill * and Professor Huxley † have not long ago given clear and trustworthy accounts of what Berkeley really taught. For these controversial chapters of Mr. Spencer's book are, in our opinion, likely to give a very misleading notion of Berkeley's thought to readers who have not already formed an accurate one. Mr. Mill most truly says in the beginning of his essay that Berkeley's adversaries have generally occupied themselves in proving what he never denied, and denying what he never asserted. And this seems to be in a great measure the case with Mr. Spencer. He does not confute, or even fairly meet, that which Berkeley in fact held concerning matter. On the other hand, Berkeley's real doctrine, as far as its negative part goes (the only part that now concerns us), is consistent enough with Mr. Spencer's results, though it is not consistent with the language in which they are expressed.

At the outset of the discussion, in announcing that "we have to take up the vexed question of subject and object," Mr. Spencer says that, "should the idealist be right, the doctrine of evolution is a dream." If "the idealist" means Berkeley, this is striking a false note already. The doctrine of evolution is a scientific theory which has for its object the explanation of phenomena—that is, the interpretation of things such as they appear to us in terms of other things such as they do or might appear to us. "To explain the phenomena is to show how we come to be affected with ideas in that manner and order wherein they are imprinted on our senses," says Berkeley's Philonous in the Third Dialogue between Hylas and Philonous, where this difficulty is anticipated and answered. The ascertaining of order and connexion amongst phenomena is independent of the question whether we are to say that the phenomena, order, and connexion which we know are supported by, or correlative to, something which is not to be known. To use an illustration somewhat in Mr. Spencer's own manner, we may possibly doubt whether a diagram we see on a screen be a figure actually drawn on the screen or a projected image. But this doubt makes no difference in our certainty as to the geometrical properties of the figure. Accordingly we do not see how it is either necessary or relevant for Mr. Spencer to stand forth as a champion of the natural belief of mankind, even on the assumption that what he defends really is the natural belief of mankind. This, of course, amounts to saying that we consider the value of what he has to say about the Knowable to be independent of his doctrine about the Unknowable, so that they need not stand or fall together. We cannot now show cause for this position at large; but it is well to explain clearly that we do hold it, and therefore feel at liberty to treat the chapters now in question as an excrescence on the general plan of Mr. Spencer's work.

However, Mr. Spencer has persuaded himself that the fundamental assumptions of philosophy must be secured by a counter-attack on the metaphysicians, which he calls the negative justification of realism, and so he attacks them one and all. He begins by charging them with excessive confidence in reason, and with setting up reason against perception when they cannot prove, and have no business to suppose, perception less likely to be right. But there is in truth no question of a "trial of Reason *versus* Perception." The object of Mr. Spencer as well as of those from whom he differs is to employ reason, not to contradict perception, but to find out what it really is and what it means; a process which doubtless involves the contradiction of various confused notions as to what it is that we perceive. We have to decide, not whether to believe or disbelieve the evidence of our senses, but which to choose amongst rival interpretations of their evidence. If any one sets up reason against perception, it is not Berkeley, who over and over again asserts the reality of perception:—

Do I not know this to be a real stone that I stand on, and that which I see before my eyes to be a real tree? . . . To be plain, it is my opinion that the real things are those very things I see and feel, and perceive by my senses. . . . A piece of sensible bread, for instance, would stay my stomach better than ten thousand times as much of that insensible, unintelligible, real bread you speak of.

And the vindicator of perception is Mr. Spencer, who may "call for pen, ink, and paper, like another man," to write its defence, but what any one of them is in its own true nature he declares positively he knows not †, only that there is an unknowable reality under these changing shapes. This seems to us to be, not defending perception, but setting up something, be it reason or unreason, in flat contradiction to perception and to the author's own warning that "reason can do nothing more than reconcile the testimonies of perception with one another."

Then the metaphysicians are accused of speaking in words which all the time protest against the thought by their implied meanings; and the conclusion is, that "language absolutely refuses to express the idealistic and sceptical hypotheses." Now this, if made out, would prove nothing or too much, for the same may be

said of an immense amount of undoubted mathematical truth. And if the objection were sound, thought and language would be fast bound to one another, and neither could ever advance. But the verbal criticisms adduced do not make out the proposition. Mr. Spencer first takes Berkeley's sentence: "By sight I have the ideas of light and colours," and elaborately entangles it by such considerations as that sight involves an eye, and the eye itself involves ideas of colour, and so on. But overmuch zeal for the fundamental relation of subject and object has led here to a confusion between the subjective and the objective way of looking at things. Speaking subjectively, my own sight, as a "vivid manifestation" (in Mr. Spencer's phrase), does not necessarily involve an eye, though it does involve certain elements of the kind called muscular sensations, which do in fact, but quite otherwise than in the act of sight, come to be known as correlative to an eye. I might see very well, though I had never seen the reflection of my own eye, nor an eye of any other creature, nor knew that there was such a thing in nature. Speaking objectively, on the other hand, sight, as an optical or physiological phenomenon to be explained, does involve an eye. But that is another matter, and is foreign, as we conceive, to Berkeley's intention in this sentence, which is, as reference to the context shows, to restrain the meaning of *sight* to subjectively considered "ideas of light and colours." As between subject and object the organism is not a medium, but part of the object. Why is Berkeley worse off when he says our "sensible body, rightly considered, is nothing but a complexion of such qualities or ideas as have no existence distinct from being perceived by a mind," than Mr. Herbert Spencer when he says it is a certain portion of the "vivid aggregate" correlated in a peculiar manner to the "faint aggregate" of manifestations—that which is manifested and that to which it is manifested being alike in themselves unknowable?

A second puzzle is made out of Hume's use of the word *impressions*. I walk gradually up to a man, at first too far off to be distinguished, till my eye is close to one button of his coat, and I see no more. In all this series of changing states of consciousness, what is my visual impression of a man? asks Mr. Spencer; and from paradoxical answers he finds refuge in "something that impresses and something that is impressed." But there is no single or comprehensive "visual impression of a man," unless we choose to give that name not to the phases themselves, but to the continuous relations amongst them. "The state of [vivid] consciousness existing at any moment during the time in which consciousness is undergoing these changes" is accompanied by the remembrance of past continuous variations and expectation of other continuous variations to come. It will be found that attention to this point removes the supposed difficulties by supplying the continuity and permanence which Mr. Spencer thinks himself driven to seek in two independent and incomprehensible existences. As to the question: At what stage between seeing the whole man and seeing only a button does the impression cease to be the impression of a man? it is a mere verbal puzzle. What we mean by seeing a man is seeing enough to infer a man from (how complex the inference is Mr. Spencer has himself pointed out elsewhere); and how much is enough depends on the circumstances in each case. A sentry who shoots at the gleam of one button in the dark may say he has seen the enemy, if the result shows that the button was on a coat, and an enemy inside the coat.

Moreover, the "something that impresses and something that is impressed" explain nothing. As they are in themselves unknowable, so are the relations between them; and we are at a loss to see how impressions or anything else are the more intelligible for being referred to unknowable relations between unknowable existences. "How is it possible," asks Berkeley, "I should be assured of the reality of this thing, which I actually see in this place, by supposing that some unknown thing, which I never did or can see, exists after an unknown manner, in an unknown place, or in no place at all?" And he amply shows, not merely that this "something which impresses" explains nothing, but that no intelligible notion of its existence can be framed.

From "The Words of Metaphysicians" Mr. Herbert Spencer passes to "The Reasonings of Metaphysicians," and makes against Berkeley in particular the charge of unfairly using the facilities of imaginary conversation. This accusation is startling. Our belief has always been that Philonous deals with all the objections which were known in Berkeley's time—not to say that he anticipates most that have occurred since. In reading Ferrier's eloquent and acute developments of his position one is constantly forced to observe how difficult it was for the most zealous and clear-sighted follower to do more than develop what the leader had laid down. But, at all events, Mr. Herbert Spencer's instance of evasion is not happily chosen. The question and answer he objects to are these:—

PHL. Is your material substance a senseless being, or a being endowed with sense and perception?

HYL. It is senseless without doubt.

He says Hylas might have brought Philonous to a stand by answering either that material substance is a being endowed with sense and perception or that he cannot say. Now either of these answers, so far from doing Hylas any good, would only hasten his discomfiture. The first would be a jump to Berkeley's ultimate conclusion, that all permanent existence is in the divine mind; the second would at once concede, what Hylas is afterwards driven to admit, that when he speaks of matter he knows not what he means. We have no space to discuss Mr. Spencer's continuation

* *Fortnightly Review*, November 1871.

† *Proceedings of the Royal Institution*, vol. vi., p. 341.

‡ See Hylas and Philonous, *Third Dial. init.*

of the dialogue as it ought to have been; but it appears to us to involve a fallacy which the author in his better judgment would be the last man to be deceived by, the confusion of the meaning of a name—to wit, material substance—with the reality of the thing denoted.

There are other arguments against idealism, all resting on the same fundamental misconception, as we cannot but deem it, of what idealism really asserts. We note, as a specimen, the "argument from priority":—

Up to a considerably advanced stage of his mental development, every one thinks of properties, not simply as implying objects but as being objectively what they seem to him subjectively. . . . Even the metaphysician, perplexed by involved reasonings, will not fail to remember that originally he regarded colours as inherent in the substances distinguished by them; that sweetness was conceived as an intrinsic property of sugar; that hardness and softness were supposed actually to dwell in stones and in flesh.

Even so; but this belief, which Mr. Spencer calls realistic, is the very stronghold of idealism, or at any rate immaterialism. This is just what Berkeley contends for, that the common voice of mankind has nothing to say about any occult reality of things as distinct from the sensible things. It is Philonous, not Hylas, who cannot for his life help thinking that snow is white and fire hot, and points out that if you ask the gardener why he thinks yonder cherry-tree exists in the garden, he shall tell you, because he sees and feels it. It is the idealist whose philosophical thought justifies his natural thought, and who refuses to separate the objective from the subjective reality of things; it is the realist who asserts that things are not objectively what they seem to him subjectively, and who shocks the common voice of mankind—which says, so far as it says anything, "We perceive the thing itself by 'vain multiplication of logical barriers between our intelligence and the thing which we suppose ourselves to know'."

All this while we are not distinctly told what is the realism which is to deliver us from the metaphysicians. However, before Mr. Spencer proceeds to his "positive justification," he makes an earnest appeal to the contemplation of a reader who has cleared his mind of hypotheses. The reader is to look at the book, and take note of his unprejudiced consciousness. The result is the recognition of the book as an external reality; "he finds that he is conscious of the book as existing apart from himself." Is this realism? It is surely consistent at least with any form of idealism which is not absolutely egoistic. Existence and external reality are not denied; the true question is, What do we mean by existence and external reality? and this is persistently evaded by Mr. Herbert Spencer's dialectic, though his analysis furnishes excellent materials for arriving at a right answer. We shall demur, indeed, to the supposition that the external reality of the book whereof our consciousness informs us is the reality of a "transfigured," unseen and invisible, unknown and unknowable book. We can only repeat with Berkeley that our consciousness tells us of no such thing, and we refuse to entertain it, not "merely because we have no notion of it, but because the notion of it is inconsistent; or, in other words, because it is repugnant that there should be a notion of it." Mr. Spencer never shows, indeed he never fairly addresses himself to showing, that the notions of external reality and existence do not indissolubly involve subject as well as object, thought as well as things. It is said later that Berkeley never succeeded in expelling the consciousness of external reality: the answer is plain—he never desired to expel it.

This critical part is followed by the "positive justification," which consists in showing that the antithesis of subject and object is a product of "normal acts of thought, like those which establish the truths we hold most certain." As this antithesis is not denied by idealists generally, and by Berkeley is especially insisted on, we have no occasion to dispute the analysis of experience into which Mr. Spencer enters for this purpose. Here he is in his proper element, and his observations on the differentiation of subject and object are full of valuable and suggestive matter, the more valuable, perhaps, for being expressed in fresh and unfamiliar terms. The investigation brings out these conclusions:—

Material substance is an "unknown correlative of the vivid state we call pressure, symbolized in the known terms of our own efforts."

That which persists or exists is the *nexus* of the ever-varying appearances of an object.

The conception we have of matter is one which unites independence, permanence, and force.

In all this we see nothing contrary to idealism. To deny that the correlative elements of all experience can be sundered in thought, which is idealism, is a different thing from asserting that one of them has no correlative; in fact it implies the correlation affirmed by Mr. Spencer. Idealists do indeed find an incongruity in speaking of one correlative as unknown when they mean that, apart from its constant correlation with the other, it cannot be the subject of any knowledge, human or otherwise; or in talking of the incapacity to know in a manner contrary to the nature of all possible knowledge as a limitation of human faculties. As to the permanent *nexus* in sensible appearances, it is fully admitted. Mr. Mill in his exposition of Berkeley has been very careful to set this forth, and to show how it agrees with idealism; and as to force, which is so much a subjective notion that some

physicists wish for scientific purposes to be rid of it altogether, it is hard to see what aid or comfort it can give to the material substratum.

Again, Mr. Spencer establishes the antithesis of subject and object by exhibiting, as the result of his analysis, two approximately parallel series of states of consciousness, which he calls the "vivid" and the "faint aggregate," relatively coherent in themselves, and incoherent with one another; a sense of internal power associated with changes in the subjective series; and a consequent idea of external power associated with changes in the objective series. But what, if anything, does this prove? Only that the individual consciousness is not wholly self-determined.

At length we come to the realism which Mr. Herbert Spencer set out to vindicate, giving us to understand that he was doing battle for the actual beliefs of mankind against philosophers. What, then, do we find? "Is it the realism of common life—the realism of the child or the rustic? By no means." A diagram is given, showing the figure or shadow of a cube projected on the surface of a cylinder, so that "the cube stands for the object of perception; the cylindrical surface stands for the receptive area of consciousness; the projected figure of the cube stands for that state of consciousness we call the perception of the object." Only it is not observed that the cube, the surface, and the projection alike are all the while related to the consciousness of the reader, which prevents the illustration from rising beyond ingenious illustration to any real analogy. But, to pass this by, what has become of the natural belief of mankind in the reality of the things they know? It is rejected under the name of Crude Realism, and the Transfigured Realism which takes its place affirms that "the projected figure [i.e. the thing as perceived] contains no element, relation, or law, that is like any element, relation, or law, in the cube [i.e. the thing in itself]." And this is the belief which is propounded as so clear and certain that opposite beliefs have never been held at all, and are propositions of which the terms cannot even be brought together in consciousness. This doctrine, which begins with denouncing the pride of reason in the name of perception, and ends with subduing perception to faith in an unknowable reality utterly unlike what is apprehended—is it rightly called transfigured realism, or is it rather pseudo-realism?

It is this kind of striving after substrata, realism, and things in themselves which really forces together incompatible terms. The would-be realist seeks to arrive by reason at an existence independent of thought. The idealist, constantly misunderstood and scouted as a visionary, protests that the search is chimerical, for the notions of *existence* and *independence of thought* are incongruous and mutually repugnant, and cannot stand together. And the protest has never been effectually set aside.

MAD DOCTORS.

FOR some time past the mad doctors have been chiefly engaged in assisting murderers to escape the penalty of their crimes. A case which has just been decided by the Judge of the Probate Court exhibits the experts in insanity in another sphere of mischievous activity. Sir J. Hannen has come to the conclusion that the late Mr. Holme, who had bad habit of swearing at lodging-house keepers and excursionists, and who had also doubts as to the honesty of shopkeepers, was not insane. It would indeed have been rather amazing if the judge had decided otherwise. If Mr. Holme was mad, there must be a vast number of mad people up and down the country who ought certainly to be locked up. We have before referred to the curious issues raised by this case as to what constitutes insanity, but we wish now to call attention more particularly to the medical evidence and the process by which a theory of insanity is constructed by professional experts. Mr. Holme was a bachelor with a considerable amount of property, which at his death he bequeathed to a number of charitable institutions. He had a sister who was very well off, and with whom he was on bad terms because she had accused him of tampering with their father's will; and he seems to have thought that he was under no obligation to leave her anything. The will was disputed on the ground that the testator was a lunatic, and the evidence of his lunacy was mainly supplied by the landladies with whom he had lodged, and by three mad doctors who had never seen him, who had never even heard of his existence until they were summoned to bear testimony to his insanity, but who, having heard or read the evidence of the landladies, were ready to go into the witness-box, one after the other, and swear that they were quite sure the old gentleman must have been mad.

This method of attempting to prove insanity strikes us as a remarkable example of division of labour. There is a Yankee story of a tree which was so very tall that it took two men and a boy to see to the top of it. One man looked as far as he could, the next began where he left off, and the little boy finished the job. In Mr. Holme's case the old women and the doctors seem to have set to work in a similar fashion. Where the old women left off the doctors began. They looked as hard as they could, and they were successful apparently in seeing all that it was desired they should see. The old women were not scientific. They knew nothing of the morbid phenomena of intelligence, or obscure diseases of the brain, or fine distinctions between dementia, delusion, and delusion. They left that for the doctors, who, however, were rather shy of giving a precise name to Mr. Holme's

* See the late Professor Grote's *Exploratio Philosophica*, 63, 144.

form of insanity. It is clear that the old gentleman was not popular with the landladies, and we can hardly wonder at it. He distrusted their honesty, he disparaged their cookery, and he cast aspersions on their sex. One of them felt this treatment so keenly that she doubled his rent. He occasionally drank too much brandy and water, and he seems to have spent the leisure of his old age in saying of his fellow-creatures what David said of them in his haste. He had a low opinion of the morality of the people of Ramsgate and of Islington, where he alternately lived; he used to wish the excursionists at the bottom of the sea, and he had been known to swear at the omnibuses in the City Road. This wicked frame of mind perhaps sufficiently accounts for his having spoken disrespectfully of Mr. Gladstone and the Government. An expert in obscure disorders of the brain might perhaps find scope for a good deal of curious research if he were to investigate the ideas which gossiping landladies are apt to form of their lodgers, above all when the lodgers are fidgety old gentlemen who swear at them. The relations between landladies and lodgers, especially in an overcrowded watering-place, are not of the kind which invariably tend to pleasant and cheerful intercourse. It is easy to understand that the late Mr. Holme was not a nice person to have to do with. He was morose, sour, distempered; he took strong views of most things, and expressed himself in violent language; he disliked noise and company, and a very little thing put him out. His landladies depicted him as a perfect ogre, though they could not quite agree as to the details of horns and hoofs; and very little knowledge of human nature is required in order to perceive that their bold, free style of portraiture must be taken with considerable qualification. As the doctors who were called to speak to Mr. Holme's insanity had never seen him, they could tell nothing from their own personal knowledge. They could only say that, assuming the landladies' stories to be true, there was reason to suppose that Mr. Holme was out of his mind. The Judge observed that, if science had arrived at such a pitch that a person by reading letters and hearing evidence could say that a testator had a particular disease, he supposed he must admit it for what it was worth. Perhaps the best way of judging of its worth will be to quote some specimens of it.

One of the doctors was greatly impressed by the character of Mr. Holme's letters. There was, he said, very little in them. They were written in an involved, clumsy style, and contained few ideas. They were all about the weather and the crops, and his own health, and his sister's and brother's health, with a little about politics occasionally. We should think that this is a very fair description of the correspondence of a vast body of our countrymen when they are writing, not on matters of business, but to friends. Even in our day great men have been known both to write and speak in an involved and clumsy style. Mr. Holme sometimes used unbecoming language. He spoke of "blear-eyed Jews," and deplored their admission to Parliament; but, as the Judge remarked, he was not singular in this aversion. One of his reasons for forming a low estimate of humanity was that the people he met were always grumbling about the weather; for his own part, he said, he had no doubt that wet weather and dry weather were both good in their way. This passage was not cited, however, as a proof of violent mania. The doctors insisted upon taking all the violent expressions attributed to the testator in a strictly literal sense. When he complained of his food, and said it was enough to poison any one, it showed he was labouring under a chronic delusion that there was a conspiracy to take his life by mixing poison with his food. When he swore at the rabble who came down to Ramsgate in the steamboats, and wished they were all at the bottom of the sea, here was homicidal passion sure enough. It was said to be impossible that a person of sound mind could utter such imprecations. It appears to be a rule with the doctors to assume that everybody who uses bad language must mean exactly what he says, and that a hot-tempered, vulgar, ignorant old man, when he vents his impatience in curses, has carefully measured his expressions, and desires their literal fulfilment.

There seems to be no doubt that Mr. Holme occasionally talked loosely and incoherently, especially when he was "muddly" of an evening after his brandy and water, and that he was nervous, excitable, and odd in his ways. On the other hand, he managed his affairs during his lifetime shrewdly enough. Although he was furious in his language, he never struck at any one or attempted to do any one any harm; he subscribed to various benevolent societies; and he gave full, accurate, and perfectly lucid instructions with regard to his will. But all this did not in the least affect the medical theory of his insanity. His rational and sensible behaviour in matters of business appears to have been regarded by the doctors as a natural, if not necessary, incident of his insanity, and rather a confirmation than otherwise of his hopelessly deranged condition. There was nothing extraordinary or outrageous in Mr. Holme's disposal of his property, and a man who has always shown himself capable of managing his affairs during his life might not unreasonably be assumed to be capable of making a will. One of the symptoms of insanity which were pointed out was the want of natural affection for his sister, who had charged him with dishonesty in regard to their father's will. Possibly this is not the first time in the history of the world that a brother and sister have quarrelled about a will, and there would seem to be about as much reason for imputing insanity on the one side as on the other. Indeed this is the beauty of this kind of medical evidence. It can be adapted to any case. Take any irascible, fidgety old lady or gentleman, rouse up all the wonderful

stories and tittle-tattle of landladies and maid-servants as to their odd ways, and the experts will do the rest. The basis of their science is that sane people are invariably rational, and never say or do anything without a good reason. To be irrational is to be mad. On such terms there are few indeed who could hope to pass safely through such an ordeal.

Mr. J. S. Mill has observed that there is something both contemptible and frightful in the sort of evidence on which attempts are sometimes made to get a man judicially declared unfit for the management of his affairs, or to upset his will if there is enough property to be worth fighting about. This time, it is true, the mad doctors had the worst of it; but it is not comfortable to think that experts are to be found who are willing to join in an attack of this kind. It would not perhaps have made much difference to the world which way Mr. Holme's property had gone. What strikes us as the most serious aspect of the matter is that the services of experts might have been sought for attack, not the disposal of his property after death, but his personal freedom while alive. Here are three doctors who feel quite sure the man was mad. The Judge decides that he was perfectly sane. But in the lifetime of the testator the signature of two of the three doctors might have been enough to shut him up for the rest of his days. It is often said that lunacy is spreading. We do not know how that may be; but at any rate there is one form of insanity which is evidently getting worse and worse, and that is the morbid delusions of the mad doctors themselves. They seem to be very much in the position of the poor gentleman who thought that all the people in the world were mad except himself. There is nothing which their morbid and distempered imaginations will not pervert into evidence of raging lunacy. Their conduct betrays all the familiar indications of mental disorder—suspiciousness, brooding over one idea, violent language, exaggerated expressions, repetitions of unmeaning phrases. It is time perhaps that the weapons which they use against the peace and order of society should be turned against themselves. If a grand commission *de lunatico* were held on the experts, their evidence against each other would probably be sufficient to justify their all being locked up out of the way. The doctors who gave evidence in this case are no doubt honourable men who firmly believe all they said. It is only their science, or what they choose to call science, that we have any quarrel with. Nobody doubts that the symptoms of insanity are various in character and degree, and that there are many persons hovering on the border-land between sanity and madness. It is impossible, as the Judge said, to draw a distinct and definite line, which shall determine exactly where sanity leaves off and insanity begins, just as it is impossible to say when the day ceases and the night has come. All that can be positively said is, that at a certain point the darkness of night has certainly fallen. But it is just because these questions of sanity are so delicate and difficult that the public has a right to expect that professional men should be careful, in the interests of science and for the dignity of their profession, as well as out of regard for social security, not to offer rash and hasty conclusions, especially when they have nothing better to go upon than the gossip of silly old women! There is no occasion on which the most skilled and experienced men are so liable to fall into error as in attempting to decide whether eccentric or outrageous acts are due to cerebral disease or simply to want of moral self-control. It is necessary, therefore, that great caution should be exercised in forming opinions on questions of this kind, and especially in acting upon them. It is not enough even that there should be scientific grounds for assuming insanity to exist. There are certain broad considerations of expediency and public policy which cannot be left out of account. It does not follow that, because a man is suffering from cerebral disease, he is therefore to be held absolutely irresponsible for his acts; and, on the other hand, a mad person who during his life does no harm to himself or others, and whose eccentricities are not more serious than those of many people who are accounted sane and rational, is entitled to the ordinary freedom of a citizen in regard to the management or disposal of his property. A well-known writer on cerebral disease complains of the inconsistency of public opinion on questions of this kind. An attempt to prove sanity and mental capacity at a Commission of Lunacy with the object of preserving intact the liberty of the subject is applauded, while any endeavour to excuse, on the plea of insanity, the crime of some unhappy wretch alleged to be an irresponsible lunatic is denounced as an unjustifiable interference with the course of justice. He also observes that an ordinary jury is incompetent "to estimate the delicate colouring, tints, and shades of the ever-varying phases and degrees of disordered and unsound mind." It may be admitted that a jury of mad doctors would have a quicker eye for the delicate colourings of insanity, but popular instincts on this matter are perhaps a safer guide in the long run. Individual liberty and responsibility are essential to social order, and there is danger in whatever tends to weaken or disturb them.

THE CORRESPONDENCE ON DOMESDAY IN THE TIMES.

EVERY thoughtful observer of things must have remarked that there has not been of late the usual abundance of those passing strange leading articles in the *Times* which have in other days caused us so much merriment. Into the cause of the change we do not presume to pry; but the fact is there. But, instead of leading articles, there has come during the last

fortnight a correspondence of the most grotesque kind, which fairly makes us wonder at the strange sort of people which there are in the world. A number of persons have been disputing about Domesday Book, most of whom at least have plainly never read a page of Domesday Book itself. A sort of free fight seems to be going on among the unlearned, while the learned seem to be folding their hands to see what the thing really will come to. Of course it is the old story; mere ignorance is by no means necessarily a fault; the fault is when people sound a trumpet before them that we may come and see how ignorant they are. We should either blame nor wonder at the first man whom we met in the road if he knew nothing about the nature of Domesday or the events of the reign of the Conqueror. The fault and the wonder is when people so needlessly proclaim to the world that they know nothing about it. Herein lies the difference—a wise man keeps his ignorance to himself; a foolish man writes to the *Times* to show it off.

Towards the end of last year there appeared in the *Times* a harmless, but not very striking or intelligent, article on the Public Records. Its writer said somewhat of Domesday, and remarked, as many people have remarked before him, that the four shires of Northumberland, Durham, Westmoreland, and Cumberland are not included in the Survey. That Lancashire also is not included in the Survey the writer did not mention, but he put on record that the cause of the omission of the other four shires was "unexplained." We can quite understand that the thing might seem a little puzzling to one who had never worked at Domesday or the age of Domesday, but who had just got up the matter for the nonce to write an article on the Public Records. The real explanation is of course not very difficult. Durham and Northumberland—Northumberland in the modern sense which had then lately come into use—must have been left out because in the great ravaging of the North they had become still more utterly wasted and worthless than Yorkshire itself. The ravages of William himself in the winter of 1069-1070, the several invasions of Malcolm the vengeances taken by Odo after the murder of Bishop Walcher in 1080, must among them have left very little in those parts which was worth surveying. As for Lancashire, it had as yet no being as a separate shire; the Ribble divided Yorkshire and Cheshire, as ages afterwards it divided the dioceses of York and Lichfield. Cumberland and Westmoreland had also no being as English shires. The southern part of the modern counties formed part of Yorkshire, and it is surveyed in Domesday as such. It is for local inquirers to trace the exact frontier, but there can be little doubt that it would be found to agree pretty nearly with the frontier of the ancient diocese of York. The northern part of modern Cumberland and Westmoreland, including the city of Carlisle, or rather its site, did not become part of the kingdom of England till the reign of William Rufus, who in 1092 drove out Dolfin and restored the city. This Dolfin seems to have been a member of the old princely family of Northumberland, and he must have held the country under Scottish over-lordship. The country had been held by the Scottish Kings as a fief ever since the grant by Edmund the Magnificent, on the final overthrow of the old kingdom of Strathclyde. But it was only under William Rufus that it became an integral part of England. The boundaries of his conquest are no doubt represented by the boundaries of the ancient diocese of Carlisle. The notion that this country was conquered by William the Conqueror in 1072, which was held by Sir Francis Palgrave when he wrote the History of the English Commonwealth, comes only from a confused and blundering passage in the compiler known as Matthew of Westminster, who has clearly confounded William Rufus and his father. The mistake was pointed out by Lappenberg, and it was not repeated by Palgrave in his later work. That is how the case now stands. Cumberland and Westmoreland are not entered, because part of the districts now so called was not part of William's kingdom. Those parts of the modern counties which then formed part of Yorkshire are entered in their proper places. Durham and Northumberland are left out for some cause which may be called "unexplained," but which can hardly fail to have been because they were not worth entering.

All this is plain enough to those who go either to the original writers or to their latest modern interpreters. But a crowd of people seem to have been seized with an uncontrollable impulse to make guesses about the matter, and to send those guesses to the *Times*. Of course they all live in the accustomed bondage to the modern map, and cannot understand that Cumberland, Westmoreland, or anything else, can have had different boundaries then from what they have now. The one who leads the onslaught is the finest of all. He appears in the *Times* of January 7th with the date of Edinburgh and the signature of "X." The letter is worth preserving in full. There is something so charming in the confidence of a man who has seemingly never read a word of the authentic history of William's Northern conquests, and who fancies that Seward was a king, and that he lived on into the reign of William:—

An article appeared in the *Times* on the subject of "The Public Records," in which you mention that for some "unexplained" reason the counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Durham do not appear to be included in *Domesday Book*. I believe the reason is that these counties were not conquered by King William. At that period Scotland was under the sovereignty of Malcolm Canmore (the Malcolm of Shakespeare and successor of Macbeth). The Scottish histories relate that while the conquest of England by William was in process the King, or Earl, of Northumberland, Seward (who was grandfather of Malcolm of Scotland), added his whole

force to that of his grandson, and the further progress of William was stayed. It is also added that three great wars were engaged in, in which every effort was made by William to gain more ground, but in vain. Finally, an agreement was entered into, in which it was arranged that the boundary of the two kingdoms should be at Stanmore, a little to the south of the county of Durham, where a stone cross was erected as a landmark, bearing the effigies of the two Sovereigns:—

The ancient cross of Stanmore,
In northern neck of Yorkshire,
Had statues twain in armour;
At South was England's conqueror,
At North was Malcolm Canmore.

For this he is on January 9th very properly taken to task by one who signs himself "H," who is "sure that the *Times* cannot wish English History to be falsified" "on the sole authority of some doggerel, the source of which 'X.' does not give us." "H." exclaims, with some simplicity, but with much truth, "Surely the Bishops of Durham were always English Bishops." And he reminds "X." of the obvious fact that "Malcolm Canmore was killed at Alnwick while invading Northumberland." He has also a "belief" about the homage of Cumberland, a little hazy perhaps, but still comforting after the nonsense of "X." Altogether "H." is very well as far as he goes, only his notions savour a little too much of the light of nature. "X." however is not satisfied, and we get him again on January 13th with another charming piece of simplicity:—

In reference to a letter signed "H." I have to say that the Cathedral of Durham was founded by King Malcolm, and there may be records showing, whether the whole, or only a part, was built by him. I subjoin extracts from Buchanan, one of the most learned of the Scottish historians.

He says that Edgar, to whom the Crown of England belonged, having obtained refuge in Scotland, William demanded that he should be given up. This Malcolm refused. "On this a war ensued between the Scots and English, wherein Sibert, King of Northumberland, took part with the former." On the defeat of William's first army the Earl of Gloucester was sent with a larger force, but with no greater success. At length Odo, brother of William, came north with a still more formidable army, committing great ravages in Northumberland, but could make no head against the northern forces.

The notion of Malcolm founding Durham Cathedral of course comes from the passage of the Northern interpolator of Florence;—whom, notwithstanding the criticisms of Mr. Hodgson Hinde, we still wish to believe in, and to call Simeon of Durham. According to this account Malcolm was present at, and took a part in, the ceremony of laying the first stone. But there is something grotesque beyond measure in the notion of searching for records to find out how much of the existing church was built by Malcolm, when, first, he was killed in the same year in which he laid the stone, and when, secondly, the history of the building of the church of Durham is thoroughly well known from the tract printed in the *Decem Scriptores*, which tells how much was built by William of St. Carilef, how much by the monks, and how much by Ralph Flambard. Where "X." or his authority Buchanan found the mass of myths which follows it is hardly worth while to search out, but at any rate they do not come from any writer of the eleventh or twelfth century. A piece follows about setting up a cross at Stanmore, and how Edgar was received into William's favour, and "never departed from the Court." Therefore we suppose the Peterborough Chronicler and Florence were both wrong in saying that he went away into Normandy and Apulia in 1086.

Meanwhile one or two other people had had their say against "X.;" the point with most of them being not so much that they are actually wrong in what they say, as the amusing way in which they put things, the way in which they lag behind the time, and go to worse authorities when better are to be had. For instance, on January 7th, one who signs himself "S. D. Scott" writes to correct "X.," and says that, "had he referred to the old chronicles, or to Thierry's *History of the Norman Conquest*, he would have altered his opinion." Thierry therefore marks the extent of Mr. Scott's modern reading, and the "old chronicles" turn out to be Matthew Paris—that is, doubtless the St. Albans compilation known by his name, Alfred of Beverley, and Peter Langtoft. He does however seem to have got a glimpse of one page of the Yorkshire Survey, and by these means he has been enabled to get to the truth, unknown by "X.," that William not only conquered Northumberland, but thoroughly harried it. On Cumberland and Westmoreland this writer does not touch. But in the same paper there is a letter from Kendal signed "C. Webster" which points out that parts of Cumberland and Westmoreland are surveyed in Domesday, though of course not under those names. But he too adds the following bit of mythical history, and shows what very odd notions some people have about these matters:—

It is believed the survey was made about A.D. 1080. These counties were not then (I write subject to correction) under Scotch rule. Certainly, though in 1053 Edward gave them to Siward, Earl of Northumberland, the Scotch were found again in possession in 1070, four years after the battle of Hastings, when, after a decisive struggle, they were expelled, and soon after the Conqueror William made good his position by granting the whole of Westmoreland and part of Cumberland to his followers, Ivo de Talbois and Randolph de Meschines.

The next day, January 8th, comes Mr. James O'Dowd, who dates from South Kensington, but who seems to have some official appointment in Northumberland. What he writes is quite to the purpose as far as it goes, only it still reveals the odd frame of mind of a man who thinks that so obvious a fact as William's conquest of Northumberland can need any kind of proof. He quotes a charter of William to the church of Durham, which he seems to

have seen in manuscript, and which we should like to see also, as it does not seem to be the same as any of the two or three Durham charters of William printed in the *Monasticon*. But Mr. O'Dowd unluckily ended with a bit which was seemingly meant for a joke:—

If William did not conquer Northumberland, he certainly disposed of a portion of it very much after Conqueror's fashion.

And on the 10th he appears again:—

On further reference to the abstracts of title to unclaimed wreck of the sea furnished to me by lords of manors in 1858, I find that the entire county of Cumberland, including the barony of Burgh, was granted by William the Conqueror to Ranulph de Meschines, by whom it was shortly afterwards given to Robert de Trivers. This fact is stated in the abstract furnished to me by Mr. Nanson, solicitor of the Earl of Lonsdale.

This draws forth a letter, which we suppose is meant to be witty signed "Coll Maclellan," and dated from Cannon Street London:—

Mr. O'Dowd's discovery of a grant of Cumberland to Ranulph de Meschines by William the Norman proves nothing. Nearly 500 years later Henry VIII. made a grant of lands in the South of Scotland to Sirs Ralf Evers and Bryan Layton.

If I recollect aright the battle of Ancrum Moor settled that affair. Perhaps if Mr. O'Dowd were to make further inquiry he might find a similar result in the case he refers to.

But about this abstract of title we should like to know something more. Nothing is more certain, as Lappenberg has shown, than that the whole story about Ranulph de Meschines is a mere jumble of events of the reign of William Rufus and Henry the First, transferred to wrong times and persons. Mr. O'Dowd ought to be provided with some very strong evidence indeed to show that William the Conqueror had anything to do with Cumberland—that is, with any part of modern Cumberland besides what was then part of Yorkshire.

Then came a lull for a few days, but on January 15th silence again was broken by Mr. Richard S. Ferguson—a different person of course from Mr. Robert Ferguson, but who clearly has some local knowledge, and who refers to Mr. Hinde's paper on the Early History of Cumberland in the sixteenth volume of the *Archaeological Journal*, 1859. If "X." and his brethren had read this paper, and also the papers of Mr. Hinde and Mr. Longstaffe on the history of Newcastle and Durham in the Newcastle volume of the Archaeological Institute, they might perhaps have been somewhat less rash in their guesses. On the strength of this paper Mr. Ferguson is able to point out the impossible story about Ranulph de Meschines, and he has some idea about part of Cumberland being included in Domesday and part not. He also notices the old boundary of the dioceses, but seemingly without feeling that this is the very root of the matter. He has also much to say about an Earldom of Carleolium, of which Mr. Hinde has something to say in later times, but which Mr. Ferguson seems to carry back to the days before Eadmund the Magnificent. Altogether Mr. Ferguson, by referring to the works of so thorough an inquirer as Mr. Hinde, has opened a new way of looking at the matter as compared with those who went before him; but he seems to have read nothing besides Mr. Hinde's paper, and to have somewhat muddled what he read there.

At length at the last moment a scholar is moved to speak. On January 16 Mr. Luard, without touching the main subject, writes to show that the story about Ranulph de Meschines has not even the authority of Matthew of Westminster, if, as he cautiously guards himself, there ever was any Matthew of Westminster. The whole tale comes from a note which some anonymous writer has written in the margin of one of the manuscripts of Matthew Paris. That matter, therefore, is settled. If Mr. Luard, or any other scholar of the same rank as Mr. Luard, had taken the matter in hand from the first, a good deal of nonsense might perhaps have been spared, but with the nonsense we should have lost an instructive lesson in one side of human nature.

We must not forget to add that in the middle of all this, on January 8th, the writer of the article on the Public Records himself steps in with a long extract from Ellis's Introduction to Domesday, containing extracts from Orderic and William of Malmesbury, from Kelham and Brady—Kelham, let us add, was, according to his light and opportunities, a far better commentator than Ellis—still these extracts are all very well, and, much as we want a real critical edition of Domesday, Ellis has his use till that happy time comes. But it is certainly funny to read the grand way in which the writer of the article speaks of Sir Henry Ellis, a way so grand as to suggest the idea that he had never looked at the Introduction to Domesday, except for the purposes of this particular article. We give the beginning and ending of his letter:—

As certain of your correspondents are trying to explain why the northern counties should have been excluded from the survey of *Domesday*, it may not be out of place to quote from the pages of the chief authority on the subject. Sir Henry Ellis, in his general introduction to *Domesday Book*, printed under the direction of the late Record Commissioners, essayed his best to arrive at some solution of the matter, and though he modestly stated that he had but opened the way to a better knowledge of the contents of *Domesday*, few as yet have been able to add to his information.

I beg to refer the curious on this subject to the exhaustive volumes from which I have quoted, and to which I am indebted for my information, of Sir Henry Ellis.

We beg to refer the curious on the subject to Domesday itself and to the contemporary writers.

CREDIT.

THE correspondence in the newspapers as to the comparative merits of shops and Co-operative Stores is briskly kept up, and it is evident that the natural and necessary consequences of doing business on credit are beginning to be generally understood. The longer the question is discussed, the more clearly will it appear that credit is really at the bottom of it. At this season of the year, when bills are flowing in, the disadvantages of the credit system are probably impressed with considerable force on many minds. In commerce nothing is to be had for nothing. Everything must be paid for, and credit has its price as well as everything else. A moment's reflection will show that a shopkeeper cannot afford to lend money to his customers—and credit is, in fact, only another name for a loan—without being remunerated for it in one way or other. If you buy a particular kind of wine from your wine merchant this year, and next year you want some more of the same vintage, you must expect to pay more for it. The wine-merchant will keep the wine for you, if you like, but he must have interest on his capital; and ordinary shopkeepers must get their interest too. It may not be specified in the bill, but it is charged all the same. If the shopkeepers made only the people who get the benefit of this accommodation pay for it, it would be reasonable enough. It is absurd to suppose that they can sell goods on credit at cash prices; but it is rather hard that those who pay cash should be charged at the same rate as the credit customers. There is no secret as to the way in which the ordinary retail shopkeeper does business. He has only one price for his commodities, and the price is fixed so as to allow what he considers an ample margin for interest on capital and bad debts. It is not surprising that those who pay for what they buy should at last begin to kick against having to pay not only for themselves, but for others who do not pay at all. Some customers pay over the counter, others have weekly bills, others pay at uncertain intervals, and some occasionally disappear without paying at all. There is only one system of doing business under which bad debts can absolutely be avoided, and that is the system of cash payments on delivery; and this ought to be the normal basis of retail trade. Those who want credit should be made to pay for it in exact accordance with the amount of the loan and the length of time during which it runs. To spread the cost of credit over the whole business, and make people bear a share of it even when they pay ready money, is obviously as unjust as it would be, for example, to make people who come only for tea pay something additional as a contribution to the expense of providing certain other people with coffee. Credit is just as much a commodity as tea or sugar, and should be sold by itself and at its own price.

All this is sadly elementary; yet it is surprising how little it is practically appreciated. The majority of customers undoubtedly pay for what they buy, and most of them pay either at once or within a few days. It is quite clear that if the majority thoroughly realized in their own minds what the credit system implies, they would resolutely refuse to go on paying any longer for the people who never pay at all or pay only at long and capricious intervals. As the strike of ready money customers has not yet become general, we can only suppose that they have not had time to master this exceedingly simple and elementary problem. The shopkeepers would of course be bound to follow the dictates of the majority of their customers, and the improvident and prodigal minority would be left out in the cold. It may be hoped that the shopkeepers themselves, now that their eyes are being opened by this useful discussion, will understand their own interests sufficiently to do justice to their best customers instead of continuing to sacrifice them to their worst as they do now. It suggests an odd phase of human nature that tradesmen should be so anxious to lay traps for themselves and to increase the hazards and losses of their business. They seem to have a notion that the credit customers, though they are the worst in one way, are the best in another. They are a risky speculation, but then, if the speculation pays at all, it pays well. Credit customers do not keep a sharp eye on price-lists, or check accounts, and the shopkeeper takes care to swell the total so as to net a handsome profit if the bill is ever paid. It is impossible to check items at the end of a year or two years, and the longer the bill runs the faster it grows. If anybody who pays cash or has weekly bills will allow his bills to stand over for a month or so, he will probably be startled at the number of things which have been set down to him which he never recollects having seen, and also at the strange advance in the prices of familiar commodities. The gains from this class of customers may be perilous, but when they come they have a large and attractive look. In the long run no doubt the tradesman does not make so much in this way as he might make by cultivating a steady cash business with moderate profits and quick returns; but there is something exciting in the reckless and dishonest game which is not without its temptations. A pretence of allowing discount for cash is sometimes kept up. Five per cent. is allowed, but this is a trivial abatement from the twenty-five, or in many cases fifty, per cent. which has been stuck on in order to cover the risks of selling goods on credit. At a West End tailor's or jeweller's fifty per cent. would be a low estimate of the addition made to prices on this account. In these and kindred lines of business credit is allowed to an absurd and monstrous extent; almost anybody of good appearance, who has a respectable address to give, can order goods to a large amount, especially if there have been some previous small dealings to start the acquaintance. The shopkeepers go in deliberately

for this speculative and perilous kind of business. They know perfectly well beforehand that on the doctrine of probabilities they must, when running such constant risks, suffer in a certain number of cases for their temerity. If it were only a question between the shopkeeper and his debtors, they might be left to fight it out between them. The tradesman has a right to run these risks if he chooses, but it is rather hard that he should make his cash customers smart for it. There is another reason perhaps why tradesmen like to give credit; they seem to have a notion that they thus acquire a hold upon customers, who will feel bound, when they owe money, to keep on giving orders, and will not like to go to other shops. A wise tradesman would understand that the most effectual means both of getting and keeping customers is to supply uniformly good articles at moderate prices.

There are many reasons why it would be well if a strong effort were made to discourage the system of doing business on credit which is now carried to such a foolish and ruinous extent in London. First, there is the waste of it. It adds enormously to the prices of all kinds of goods. The retail vendor has to lock up a larger amount of capital in his business than would otherwise be necessary. The chances are that it is not his own capital; it is probably partly borrowed, and partly made up of credit from the wholesale houses with which he deals. He is cramped and fettered by debt, and becomes helpless in the hands of the wholesale people, who could sell him up any day, and who know that he dare not complain whatever may be the quality of the goods they choose to send him, or whatever may be the prices at which they invoice them. The result is that he carries on his business in an expensive way, and that he is driven to all sorts of shifts to squeeze as much as possible out of customers, forcing up prices, and cutting down measures, and making the most of quantities by cheap adulterations. It is impossible to imagine anything more demoralizing for all concerned than the relations which naturally spring from this system. The shopkeeper has to lead a struggling hand-to-mouth existence, never free, never ahead of his business. The wholesale firms lose the benefit of the stimulus which would be applied to them if they had to deal with free, independent men, who could make their own terms, and insist upon having only goods of the best quality. The system is manifestly unjust to cash customers, who are taxed in order to make up the deficiencies of their extravagant and improvident neighbours. But perhaps the people who get credit, and who may seem at first sight to be the very people to benefit by the system, suffer most. If they are sharers or adventurers they may run away in the night when they have got all they can out of a neighbourhood; but, as a rule, of course the customers who take goods on credit are foolish, reckless people, who go on accumulating debts which hang like a millstone round their necks for the rest of their lives. They are always paying off some of the debt, but it grows faster than they can keep pace with it. They pay twice or thrice over for everything they have. Credit is tempting at first, but afterwards it becomes a kind of penal servitude. And so they go on struggling and stumbling, always getting deeper in the bog, till at last perhaps things come to crisis in a general break-up. There is nothing more pathetic in its way than a stylish family in a big house being dunneyed by the milkman. Even a milk bill will sometimes run up to 40*l.* or 50*l.*, or the greengrocer's to twice as much. From every point of view the credit system is pernicious. It is wasteful and demoralizing. It adds to the expenses of trade, and raises prices. Credit in large mercantile operations is a very different thing from credit in the petty transactions of domestic life. In the former it is, if kept within due bounds, a means of developing trade. But in private life there should be as little book-keeping as possible, and the current expenditure should be scrupulously kept within the known limits of income. If the retail dealers made it a rule to insist upon cash payments from their customers, they could in their turn make cash payments to the wholesale houses, and would acquire greater independence and freedom of action. They would be constantly turning over their capital, and would save largely in interest, bad debts, and law expenses. The reduction of prices which they would thus be enabled to effect would stimulate consumption. We have no doubt that many tradesmen are fully aware of the mischievous effects of the existing system, and would gladly reform it if they could; but they do not know how to begin. Society has its habits, and they are hard to change; and unfortunately the habit of cash payments is not as yet a very fashionable one. There is no reason why the shopkeepers should not strengthen themselves by confederation. The early-closing movement was accomplished by common agreement, and a ready-money movement would no doubt meet with similar support if it were once started. Preaching against credit is pretty much like preaching against other forms of waste or improvidence. It is an old sermon. There is nothing new to be said on the subject; but the discussion which is now going on will be useful in forcing people to reflect on the evils of the present way of doing business.

ECCLESIASTICAL LEGISLATION IN GERMANY.

IF the Bills which have just been introduced into the Prussian Chambers by the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs should become law, it is difficult to exaggerate the importance of the changes that would inevitably ensue. It has long been generally felt in Germany, and was expressly asserted the other day in a

remarkable article in the leading German newspaper, that the religious question outweighs in importance at this moment all others in the internal economy of the Fatherland. "The influence which the Roman Curia seeks to exert over the innermost life of the State is a matter of paramount importance," observes the *Allgemeine Zeitung*; "it wounds us to the core, and seriously imperils the peace and orderly development of civil life. It makes the relations of Church and State the question of the day." Two recent Acts of the German Legislature have been specially directed against this impending danger—namely, the expulsion of the Jesuits and the new regulations about the inspection of schools. To most Englishmen the first of these laws cannot fail to appear difficult of explanation or defence, nor do we intend to enter on any discussion of its merits here. If Germans assure us that circumstances render necessary in their case what to our ideas appears at best an anachronism, we do not care to dispute what our own experience happily does not help us to comprehend. The law about school inspection is more intelligible and more permanently important, when we remember the vital influence of the system of primary education on the formation of popular belief. It was on the control of the whole educational machinery, as the *Allgemeine Zeitung* truly enough points out, from the elementary schools to the Universities, that the energies of "the neo-Roman party" were principally concentrated. And it was here, we may add, that they had long been sedulously, though secretly, laying the train which finally exploded in the definitions of the Vatican Council. Of the remarkable series of pamphlets issued last year by the Abbé Michaud, none is more instructive than that on the Falsification of French Catechisms, and what he has illustrated in the case of France is true also of Germany. There too, for years before the Vatican Council, there was a gradual process of manipulation of primary religious instruction carried on, chiefly by means of the Jesuit Deharbe's catechism, working up to the full teaching of Papal infallibility. "They raised a cry of triumph when the decree was passed which they had long been looking forward to as a necessity, and straining every nerve to achieve." *Spec missis in semine* is a principle of which Ultramontanism has never been slow to avail itself; but skilfully as their plans have been laid, the harvest is by no means so abundant as the faction who are "struggling to supplant the historical basis of Christianity" have ventured to assume.

While, however, the general system of primary education has a critical effect on the moulding of national belief, even more depends on the training of the clergy, who are themselves the religious teachers of the great mass of the nation who have any religion at all. The old question, *Quis custodiet custodes?* is not of less importance in the modern than in the ancient State. And, therefore, as we began by observing, the three Bills lately introduced by Dr. Falk, if they make less show and provoke less violent antagonism than those already passed, must cut deeper in their ultimate effects. The first of these regulates the course of studies for aspirants to the priesthood; the second protects the clergy from the arbitrary despotism of the bishops; and the third, which will be sufficiently puzzling to an English reader till it is explained, provides that converts from Catholicism or Protestantism may change their communion on making a declaration to that effect before the local magistrate. The existing law requires a previous consultation with the priest or *pfarre* before secession can legally take place, and its repeal is chiefly interesting from the strangeness of the fact that it has to be repealed at the present day. But the two former Bills, and the first especially, have a much higher practical significance. It appears that since the Charter of 1850, which liberated all religious communities from State supervision, the bishops have had the entire management of clerical education in their own hands, and it is during the last quarter of a century that Ultramontane teaching has made such enormous strides in Germany. With many of the bishops themselves, trained under Jesuit auspices at Rome, acting under Jesuit guidance in the administration of their dioceses, and holding the moral and intellectual formation of their clergy under their exclusive control, this consequence was sure to follow. From earliest boyhood the young aspirant to the ministry is sharply marked off from his secular comrades, trained in separate seminaries under a rigorous discipline of surveillance and police, till from the *petit séminaire*, as it would be called in France, he passes to the larger seminary, which perhaps may be connected with a University, but even so is kept strictly under ecclesiastical supervision. And if we ask what kind of intellectual training these exclusively clerical seminaries supply, it is easy at least to specify what, according to the Council of Trent, on whose decrees they are based both historically and in principle, they are intended to supply. The youths trained there are to be taught "grammatices, cantus, computi ecclesiastici, aliarumque bonarum artium disciplinam, sacram Scripturam, librosecclesiasticos, homiliae Sanctorum, et sacramentorum tradendorum et rituum et ceremoniarum formas." In other words, the prescribed curriculum is rigidly narrow and professional, and omits the main elements of what is called a liberal education. And if it is thus defective on the intellectual side, in its moral aspect it is open to still graver criticism. The jealous separation of boys destined for the priesthood from their fellows throughout the whole educational career, even supposing that a vocation involving lifelong celibacy could be profitably tested at ten years old, is, to say the least, a serious mistake. It is the inevitable tendency, if not the direct object, of such a system to freeze and isolate the sympathies and stunt the healthy develop-

ment of character; in a word, to fabricate machines rather than to train men. Its practical effects under the most favourable circumstances are seen in France, where the want of independence of character and the low intellectual standard of the priesthood as a class, have combined to alienate from their control the male intellect of the country. And it is remarkable that those of the Catholic clergy who in recent times have wielded the greatest influence over the life and thought of their contemporaries have been men not originally trained for the office, but who have passed in middle life, like Newman, or Ravignan, or Lacordaire, from another communion or another calling to the service of the altar. It is this system which the proposed law would bring to an end in Germany. The seminaries for boys are to be abolished when vacated by their present occupants, and the future priests are to receive their education in the public schools and Universities, their strictly professional course being based on a previous proficiency in general subjects instead of being substituted for it. This, it may be remembered, was one of the points chiefly insisted upon in the programme of the Old Catholic Congress at Munich in 1871. And it must be obvious on the surface to the advocates and the enemies alike of the present system how vast a change its abolition would eventually involve.

Nor is this the only change that is contemplated. If the existing discipline serves to mould the clergy into pliant tools, the bishops have every opportunity of keeping them such for life. It is probable that with a clergy differently trained, whose support they could rely upon, the German bishops who have one by one been falling off from the ranks of the Opposition might have found courage to spare themselves the public humiliation of enforcing under anathema the very doctrine they had confuted and denounced. Be that as it may, the comparative paucity of avowed dissentients among the clergy is notoriously measured by their arbitrary power of enforcing submission, which henceforth is to be largely curtailed. Their appointments to livings will be made subject to the approval of the Government, and their favourite practice of appointing provisionally incumbents whom they could thus keep in absolute dependence on their own caprice, will be restricted to the period of a year, nor will they be allowed to retain in their cures priests who have been deprived for civil offences. And, on the other hand, those who are deprived by the bishops for obeying the law of the State will have a right to appeal to the civil courts, very much like apparently what is called the *appel comme d'abus* in France. It is not so easy to appreciate the force of another regulation which vests the power left in the hands of the bishops in themselves alone, "to the exclusion of the Pope and all non-German authorities"; for, unless all intercourse with Rome is forbidden, and the prohibition rigidly enforced—which would be equivalent to creating formal schism—they are pretty sure for the present to exercise their powers under Papal direction, whether formally expressed or not. It will take some years, of course, for a new generation of clergy to grow up under these changed conditions of discipline and general culture, supposing Dr. Falk's measures to become law; and no important result therefore, can be looked for in the immediate future. But meanwhile the position of the Old Catholics will be materially strengthened in the Empire, and their ranks are likely to be augmented by fresh recruits from the parochial clergy, when fidelity to conviction no longer means starvation and disgrace. But it remains to be seen whether the hierarchy will submit to the new conditions to be imposed on it without a desperate struggle. There is no point that has been more strenuously insisted upon during the last three centuries, wherever Rome and her faithful pretorian, the Jesuits, could have their way, than the separate system of seminary training, which may indeed for the purposes of the Curia be almost regarded as the key of the whole position. It provides in every country a well drilled army, through which the *not d'ordre* from headquarters can be swiftly and surely circulated at any moment, and whose first instinct will be not to reason, but to obey. Such an organization is invaluable from the Roman point of view; but in proportion as it promotes the ends of a centralized Papal bureaucracy, it is not unnaturally regarded with disfavour by society generally, and with jealous suspicion by the State.

AMERICAN JOURNALISM.

AMERICAN journalism is coming to the front at the Vienna Exhibition. An imitator of Mr. Cole, C.B. has proposed to form a catalogue of American periodical literature, with specimens, and it is expected that by this means an idea of the great mental activity of America will be impressed upon European visitors to the Exhibition. Some visitors might perhaps think that it is possible for a country to have too many newspapers or to spend too much time in reading them, but that view is not likely to be accepted by the projector of this catalogue. "Ours," he says, "is pre-eminently a country of newspapers." He challenges the outside world to show anything approaching the enterprise, vigour, and extent of American journalism. "An opportunity now presents itself for making good our claim to this distinction." It is proposed to exhibit a single specimen number of every newspaper, magazine, or review issued in the United States, and the collection would also embrace all periodical publications circulated gratuitously by tradesmen. To collect and classify such an immense mass of material will be a

laborious task, to which, however, the patriotic energy of the projector promises to be equal. Indeed he undertakes even more than this. The collection is to include also almanacs and year-books, periodical reports on matters of general interest, transactions of learned societies, "certain periodical patent medicine pamphlets, and similar publications." The collection will be arranged geographically, "so that every section of the country may receive due credit for its contributions to periodical literature—the education of the masses."

It is remarkable that the author of this proposal does not see that his collection would not excite the slightest interest in the majority of visitors to the Exhibition except perhaps as a convenient magazine of waste paper. As regards Englishmen, many of us when we go upon a holiday abhor the sight of any print beyond a guide-book; and at any rate we have enough of reports and circulars and pamphlets at home, and do not care to be overwhelmed with the produce of America. If it were a thing to be proud of, we could ourselves make a considerable contribution to such a collection as is here proposed. An enthusiastic admirer of penny-postage once proposed the number of letters received within a given area as a test of the happiness of its inhabitants. This projector would perhaps consider the quantity of circulars issued in a district as a measure of its education or intelligence. He proposes to give the outer world an opportunity of seeing "with what comparative exhaustiveness even the special subdivisions of trades are represented in the periodical press of the United States." If the outer world felt any curiosity on the subject, we could easily convince it that trades are represented in the periodical press of England to an extent that is not only comparatively, but positively, exhausting to those who have the misfortune to be familiar with it. There was, and probably is, a periodical called the *Grocer*. Such a periodical would doubtless be useful and interesting to many London tradesmen, but we should not have dreamed of exhibiting it to the people of all nations who will be collected at Vienna, and of whom the great majority will not understand one word of English. We should hardly think that even the most industrious German would be tempted to acquire our language for the sake of reading a leading article upon sugar. Nor can we conceive that either a single number or even an entire series of the *Grocer* would form a very stupendous spectacle for the foreigner who could not read it. However, let us say no more at present about our own periodicals, whether they represent trade or anything else. We will leave to America undisputed possession of the wonderful supposition that all mankind must be interested in publications which only a few could, and still fewer would, read. It is suggested, indeed, that the proposed catalogue of American publications may sometimes be useful for purposes of business. "Suppose a merchant in a distant part of the world desirous of information touching Petroleum in America." We should expect that he would write to a correspondent. But this projector expects that he would look at the index of the catalogue, "where he would be immediately referred to the *Titusville Herald* and such other American journals as represent this interest." Considering that the merchant in a distant part of the world, even if he happened to have the catalogue at hand, would certainly be obliged to await a return of post from America before he could be supplied with the *Titusville Herald*, and that perhaps he could not read it when he had got it, we remain of our original opinion that he would be likely to seek information about petroleum by ordinary correspondence. But still it is permissible to American vanity to speculate on the effect to be produced on the mind of a Transylvanian or a Belgian by the sight of a copy of the *Titusville Herald* in the Exhibition at Vienna.

We have obtained the above particulars from a circular issued to the publishers of American newspapers and periodicals, inviting them to make returns descriptive of the "broader characteristics, as well as the individual features," of their publications. It might be interesting to outsiders to see a collection of similar returns made on account of the English press; but it is hardly probable that a Frenchman or German would take the trouble to understand them. There is probably no foreigner who can distinguish the religious sects and parties into which we are divided; and still less would it be possible to derive any clear idea from a classification of newspapers by religion, even if the newspapers were able to classify themselves, which would, as we think, be difficult. We frankly admit the "exhaustiveness" of the proposed classification, and indeed we should expect that it would exhaust both the energy of the publishers and the patience of the public. "Thus," says the circular, "under the heading 'Commerce,' a leading periodical would be further qualified as 'free trade' or 'protectionist'; under 'Religion' as 'episcopal,' 'presbyterian,' 'Lutheran,' 'Jewish,' and, with the various shades represented, 'orthodox,' 'reformed,' &c." It is added that this exact classification must be of essential service both at home and abroad to subscribers as well as to advertisers. All this is exactly in the style in which Mr. Cole, C.B. recommended his Universal Catalogue of Art Books, in which, however, the public failed to see any utility at all, except as a convenient method of providing public employment and pay for professors of the art of using scissors and paste. The proposal to specify the political character of newspapers seems to us an instance of what is called "putting too fine a point upon it." Thus it might be difficult for anybody in or out of Printing-house Square to define the politics of the *Times*. As far as we can understand the principle of classification, it would not be necessary for any of the London daily newspapers to explain whether they have any and what religion. But

when we come to weekly newspapers we are not quite sure how to deal with them. There are two or three such newspapers of which the name will occur to every reader. They supply political, social, and even fashionable intelligence, both home and foreign, and it might be inferred from the prominence which they give to particular heads of news that the larger part of their readers are clerical. These newspapers, therefore, feel called upon to have a religion, and we will assume that they are capable of describing it. But if every periodical that circulates primarily among the clergy is under the same obligation, it would apply, among others, to the *Clerical Directory*. On looking at the published form of return we find more questions asked than are likely to be answered. A newspaper is not, we think, bound to state its circulation any more than a lady is to disclose her age. It would be entirely contrary to English practice to publish the editor's name. As regards the "subject-matter of publication" the answer would perhaps be easy to the publisher, although apparently difficult to anybody else. Thus we have before us a paper called the *Metropolitan*, of which we assume the object is to furnish information specially interesting to the inhabitants of London. Such a paper clearly need not have a religion, and we should think that, in any but a local sense, it need not have any politics. It publishes at full length the proceedings of the Metropolitan Board of Works, which may be considered from its point of view as superior in importance to those of the Imperial Parliament. Besides this paper, which aims at representing the whole metropolis, each considerable section has one or more newspapers which concern themselves with local interests in a narrower sense. Then there are journals which devote themselves to writing down the liquor trade, or the use of tobacco, or the Game-laws. We have seen lately a publication calling itself *Sale and Barter*, which purports to be "a universal register of property for disposal," but which nevertheless makes excursions into the domains of literature, politics, and possibly religion. All these publications are useful in various ways, and some of them perhaps are ornamental. They show intellectual activity of a certain kind; but if we have in England a journal devoted to the tobacco trade, we should rather accept the fact in silence than boast of it to the universe. Unfortunately the habit of tall talk is deeply rooted in America, and native readers of this circular are likely to be insensitive to its grotesque character. Let us hope that this country is not quite so far gone in the same bad way. The number and variety of our newspapers prove our wealth and material resources, but are less conclusive upon the question whether our people are educated as they ought to be.

SHRINES AND THEIR VISITORS.

WHEN we read of expeditions of the faithful such as that which has just made its annual start from Cairo for the Kaaba, we are almost inclined to lament the decay of faith in Christendom, and to regret that what used to be the religion of conviction should pass now for superstition. When the Church approved the pilgrimages which sought absolution and the remission of sins through a long series of perils and hardships, it only sanctified and utilized a principle which had been a spring of human action from the most remote ages. Faith hallowed works. As the devout Mussulman to this day can only die in peace and hope when his face is turned to Mecca, so there was unspeakable comfort alike to the oppressors of the middle ages and to their victims when they turned their backs on the world in which they had sinned and suffered. Their betaking themselves to pilgrimage was the visible sign of the repentance that was to soothe the remorse, of the final renunciation of the earthly ambitions which had been a snare to them. It was the foretaste of the heavenly joys which were to recompense worldly griefs and miseries. We can in some measure conceive the exaltation or prostration of mind that induced them to set themselves to work out their salvation by a slow, painful, and wearing process. The solitary pilgrim who started from the shores of the West for the Holy Sepulchre and the scenes of the Passion and Crucifixion could feel little confidence that his strength and means would ever carry him to the distant end of his journey. The simplicity of his outfit indicated the hopelessness of making fleshly preparations adequate to an undertaking so formidable. With his gown of serge and his staff, his scrip, his sandals, and his scallop-shell, he made his start, relying on his helplessness and on charity, next to the guardianship of the saints and angels. If the symbols of his calling usually served as a passport through the domains of the truculent petty tyrants who levied contributions on every one else; if his poverty was a safeguard among those roving bands of freebooters who ambushed themselves in the forests, and flayed and plundered travellers on their own account; if he often found harbour for the night and rude hospitality from some monastic establishment bound by its vows to entertain pilgrims, or from poor peasants who looked for repayment from above for the crust and cup of cold water they bestowed in charity—still his sufferings must have been great even while his route yet lay through Christian countries, and many a constitution enfeebled by excess or privation must have succumbed. He was condemned to perpetual silence and denied all human intercourse, save that of looks and signs, as he journeyed onwards among people of strange speech; his fare was coarse and scanty, and his quarters were rough at the best; he was exposed to all the vicissitudes of seasons

and weather, and he had to perform a pedestrian feat over execrable roads which would have sorely tested the endurance of the toughest and most highly trained professional of modern times. But hardships changed to deadly and constant peril when he had to pass on to the territory that was under the sway of the Soldan. In spite of a certain sympathy which even Moslem fanatics felt for travellers bound on a holy pilgrimage, in spite of a precarious protection from those military monks who upheld Christianity and championed Christians in Palestine, it remains a mystery how even the few who did live on were ever spared to kneel at the Sepulchre. The reward of those few no doubt was great, and even those who died in striving after its attainment died in hope, if not in assurance. But it is no wonder that, as scepticism in later centuries spread with enlightenment, faith, growing feebler, should shrink from an ordeal so terrible and from sacrifices so tremendous. Men began to seek absolution by instalments. They squared their spiritual accounts by shorter and less formidable pilgrimages; and more accessible shrines, like that of the sainted Becket, grew fast in favour and renown. The dignified priests, who assumed greater authority as they were enriched by the offerings of the throngs of worshippers, made it matter of conscience or interest to expatriate on the miraculous potency of their patron saint in all matters spiritual and carnal. Then, in place of those long wanderings when men as it were partook of the viaticum before a journey that must probably be their last, we have the cheery Canterbury pilgrims cantering across the bright pages of Chaucer, and lightening the way with their merry tales. Their sins and peccadilloes sat as easily upon them as those of the Belgravian penitents who crowd in the very latest fashions to hang upon the eloquent lips of some Charles Honeyman.

That fresh old faith still survives among the more dreamy Orientals in all its fulness, and one is half tempted to envy it to them. How long it will linger on in anything like its pristine freshness and vigour even in the East it is difficult to say; but we suspect that material influences will sap it more swiftly and surely than moral ones. It is not certain that even the spread of education will fatally impair it. The religion of shrines and of pilgrimages is of the very essence of Mahomedanism, and a Mahomedan is seldom the less devout because he has learned to go straight to his sacred writings for instruction as to the tenets of his faith. But in proportion as science and enterprise facilitate these holy journeys, as philanthropists encourage road-making and introduce sanitary improvements at the most renowned religious centres, as time is economized and mortality diminished, so the pilgrimages will assume an altered aspect. The number of votaries may increase for a time, but pilgrimage will be undertaken in a lighter spirit. We may call the motive that has hitherto sent men on such journeys superstition if we will; still it is impossible that people should not more or less feel it to be a serious matter to be travelling in the shadow of probable death. One remembers the graphic chapter in which Dr. Hunter describes those stupendous human sacrifices which are periodically offered at the shrine of Jaggañáth. The vexed question as to whether the devotees cast themselves deliberately under the ear of the idol is of little consequence. They perish by thousands, by a death almost as certain, in the city of Puri, and on the roads that lead to it. They toil thither over burning plains and through pestilential swamps; they sojourn at the place itself in a crowded hotbed of disease, whose streets are so many streaming cesspools fermenting under a blazing sun; they feed upon putrid rice and sweetmeats until these scanty supplies of slow poison run out, and then they starve. There must be something that is solemn and sincere about a journey that is likely to lead you literally through the Swárág-Dwára—the gate of heaven—although the motives that inspire it may be mingled, and although there may be much that is ludicrous and trivial in its episodes. So in that annual expedition of pious Mahomedans who make Cairo their starting point for Mecca. It may not be so terrible an affair as its Hindu counterpart, and the goal at Mecca is looked forward to as a place of repose and refreshment, but nevertheless many drop by the way. For weeks, if not months, before the caravan starts, the men who mean to join it come flocking in to Cairo. Many of them ply their industries, or sell the wares they have brought from their own far countries, by way of providing for their travelling expenses. But, grave as is the ordinary population to be seen in the Cairo bazaars, you imagine that the faces of these stranger pilgrims look more serious than those of their neighbours. Nor is it surprising. It is not playing at religion to travel in a slow caravan through the sands, sunlight, and simoom of the burning Desert, keeping body and soul together with a stock of provisions which there is seldom the means of replenishing; with brachish water simmering in the bottom of their diacid water-skins, speculating on the possible contents of the next distant well—to say nothing of the chances of attack from wandering Ishmaelitish robbers who may not even respect the sacred Kiswéh or the Mahmal. Yet the sufferings of Hindu and Moslem pilgrims have already been shortened; their expenses and the risks they run have been reduced. Puri and Mecca owe not a few of their visitors nowadays to Western energy and joint-stock enterprise. Many of the worshippers of Jaggañáth are carried cheaply third-class by Indian Railway Companies to the edge of the swamps and wastes through which they have to foot it. Moors and Algerians, Syrians and Persians, take their steerage passage to Alexandria on board a Mediterranean screw-steamer, in place of crowding together on some primitive craft which beats up slowly against the adverse elements,

and whose decks are swept in turn by the chopping seas and the unwieldy boom of the tremendous lateen sail. Sooner or later the Railway Companies of Northern India may construct an Orissa Extension; a native Board of Works may undertake the purification of Puri under English superintendence, and a city of model lodging-houses may rise round the gates of Jagannâth's temple. Sooner or later that system of Egyptian railways which is stretching itself towards the oases in the Libyan Desert and the sources of the Nile will doubtless embrace the caravan road to Arabia; while, should the improving traffic be sufficiently encouraging, a regular line of steamers may be established to ply in correspondence with the port of the holy Mecca. Only, if the manner of pilgrimage comes to be modified by modern facilities, the spirit will probably be transformed as well.

If we were to speculate on the day when some Hindu or Egyptian Cook will organize his pilgrim parties and issue his programmes and coupons—the system, indeed, is to a certain extent adopted in India already—we should scarcely exaggerate the probabilities of the case. We have actually seen what is the nineteenth-century counterpart of the old Christian pilgrimages, primitive and mediæval. The catastrophe which has befallen France, with the consequent depression, searchings of hearts, and self-humiliation, created a state of feeling which was morbid, although unquestionably sincere. Minds were stirred, and the contagion spread in devout circles as it did in other times. The sneers of polite sceptics, the threats and abuse of the democratic crowds, far from deterring, acted as incentives. They represented that more material persecution of darker times under which faith proverbially flourished. Yet what did the movement come to after all? We do not venture to scrutinize the secrets of individual hearts, or to appraise the aggregate amount of genuine religious feeling; but we may be sure that only intense earnestness and exceptionally profound enthusiasm could have altogether resisted the disenchantment of uncongenial and commonplace surroundings. Crowds gathered at the Madeleine to receive, among other excellent advice, words of practical counsel as to the travelling commissariat. There were special trains and first-class carriages for those who could afford them, perhaps somewhat crowded. The worst hardship was a little cramping of the limbs, some slight restrictions as to personal baggage, a scramble for beds in the inns and lodging-houses of Lourdes, and sundry shortcomings in eggs and fresh butter. Of course some few impressionable, exalted, or abstracted natures may have soared superior to all these trivial commonplaces which dragged them back again to everyday life; they may have bent in concentrated fervour at the Virgin's shrine, and come home again comforted with the idea that they had done something towards saving not only their own souls, but their sinful and suffering country. But certainly it must have been far otherwise with the majority; the result of their pious experiment must have satisfied many of the devotees that the days of pilgrimages had gone by in the West. If the religion of the shrine still lingers in the East, it is because the romance and the reality of endurance and suffering remain there as well; but faith will inevitably give way to fashion as the roads to the shrine are smoothed and shortened.

THE METROPOLITAN FIRE BRIGADE.

THE duties of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade are performed by a total force of under four hundred men. The Chief Officer testifies in his Report for last year to the valuable assistance which he has received from the police as well as from the public. He draws attention to the danger to which valuable property on both sides of the Thames is exposed during a considerable portion of every day, when it is cut off from a quick supply of water. This deficiency occurs regularly twice every day, and lasts each time about eight hours—namely, from two hours after high water on the ebb tide to two hours before high water on the flood. Thus during about sixteen out of every twenty-four hours waterside premises are liable to be placed in the utmost peril by any fire occurring in them or in their immediate neighbourhood. Experience has shown that at certain parts of the banks a single line of hose cannot be got on shore in less than thirty minutes by forty skilled men working in full daylight. It is necessary to make a road over the mud by means of hurdles, matting, or other appliances, and, even after this has been done, the utmost caution is required to prevent the men falling over and being lost. It is impossible to save a man out of the mud unless he is seen at the moment of his fall and the spot is marked before the mud closes over him. Among the dangers to which firemen are exposed must therefore be reckoned this, of being smothered in the mud which intervenes between the water of the river and the fire to which they desire to apply it. The remedy for this deplorable state of things would be to provide a sufficient number of "hards" over which the firemen could pass without the delay which occurs when they have to lay down a road for themselves. It would also be necessary to provide on the land side pipes of adequate size, with a constant supply of water. At present such pipes do not exist, and thus valuable premises, being as it were between land and water, enjoy during many hours of the day the advantages of neither. A floating fire-engine is very powerful where it can float, but its efficiency depends upon the condition of the tide. Owners of river-side property will do well to consider the danger to which they are thus exposed. The skill and

courage of the Fire Brigade ought not to be neutralized by circumstances which are capable of removal.

It will probably have occurred to many persons that, considering the dangerous nature of gas, and the small caution with which it is used, the number of accidents arising from it is wonderfully small. We find from the Report before us that the number of serious and slight fires in lodgings in the year 1872 was 161, of which 44 are attributed to candles, and only 4 to gas. Of 289 fires in private houses 71 were caused by candles, and only 17 by gas. Children playing with lucifers caused 9 fires in private houses, and lucifers ignited in other ways also caused 9 fires. Thus lucifers appear to be slightly more dangerous than gas. Defect or foulness of flues caused 53 fires. Smoking tobacco caused 5 fires, and intoxication only 1. It is certainly remarkable that so small a share of mischief should be ascribed to excess in drink. It has been often observed that drunken men take much better care of themselves and their property than might have been expected. They contrive to avoid falling either into ditches or under wheels, and it would almost seem that since the new Licensing Act the greatest danger to which they are liable is a policeman. In lodgings, where perhaps there is more disorder than in private houses, the number of fires attributed to intoxication is only 4. In houses kept by "victuallers," which doubtless means persons who sell drink, not a single fire is ascribed to excessive drinking. There are, however, a considerable number of fires of which the cause is stated to be unknown, and perhaps it may be fair to assume in some of these cases obliviousness produced by drink. But even after making a considerable addition on this account, it is surprising that what the *Alliance News* would call "barrel and bottle work" makes so small a figure in these returns. Smokers at any rate have much more to answer for than tipplers.

A few years ago Captain Shaw supplied to a Committee of the House of Commons some curious calculations as to the amount "spent" in various towns on fires. In Liverpool, he said, they spend 12*l.* on each fire, and in Dublin they spend 20*l.*, while in London the cost amounted to 18*l.* These figures were doubtless obtained by dividing the total cost of a Fire Brigade in a year by the number of fires. It appeared by the same process of calculation that in Boston they spend 15*l.* on a fire, in Baltimore 10*l.*, and in New Orleans 17*l.* In New York formerly the Fire Brigade was altogether a voluntary force, if indeed it deserved to be called a force. "Their behaviour," said Captain Shaw, "was, to say the least, disorderly. There was no management, and there were constant quarrels." Nothing was properly done, and the system became at last quite intolerable, and was abandoned. A paid system was then established, which followed slowly in the footsteps of the London Brigade. The reason why they had not advanced as fast as they intended was that they had been obliged to enrol in the paid brigade so many members of the old brigade. It was suggested that these American brigades did not touch small fires; but Captain Shaw answered that they made a great deal of show and turned out the engines at great expense. The principal number of Captain Shaw's men were at that time sailors taken either from the Royal or mercantile navy. No men, he said, are so available as sailors, especially if they could be obtained young enough. The sailor has learned discipline, and is so strong and handy at climbing and other quick work that he can be made available for the general work in two or three months.

The earliest establishment by law of fire-engines in London was parochial, and dates from the year 1707. A few of the Insurance Companies had previously established engines of their own. The parish engines received rewards for attending at fires, but it was not necessary to have an effective engine in order to claim the reward, and the consequence was that the parish engines soon fell into great neglect. The beadles in charge of the engines were generally very old men, and they sent the engines out in charge of boys, and in some cases of women, and they took the rewards all the same. This being all that the law could do, the Insurance Companies tried to improve upon it by voluntary action. They tried for many years to amalgamate their forces, but there were great difficulties in the way. The chief objection was that any Companies which refused to join would still have their own engines as an advertisement, and would make themselves very much known; whereas those Companies who joined would lose the advantage of the advertisement afforded by their engines running about the streets. After a great deal of negotiation, the London fire-engine establishment was formed in the year 1833, and it lasted for thirty-three years. Immediately after the great fire in Tooley Street in 1862, the Insurance Companies began to reconsider a subject which had been frequently before them—namely, the responsibility of continuing to protect the whole of London at the expense of the insurers of London. It is wonderful that such a system should have endured so long. The Fire Brigade of the Insurance Companies was handed over to the Metropolitan Board of Works on 1st January, 1866. The chief station is at Watling Street, where it used to be. The most distant station in 1866 was three miles from the central station, but now there are stations at distances of six miles or more, and new stations are being continually added. The number of miles run by fire-engines in a year is upwards of seventeen thousand. There are few false alarms, whereas in some American cities there are many. There is still much to be done in the way of building stations, and in finding men to put into them.

London is spread over so much ground that it must be difficult to satisfy expectations which can hardly be called unreasonable.

People naturally think that there ought to be a station near them, and efforts have been made in several districts to supplement the deficiencies of the regular Fire Brigade by a voluntary organization. There is not much danger of such an organization being converted to a political purpose as was done some years ago at New York. But perhaps it might have a tendency to become ornamental rather than useful. Captain Shaw, being questioned on this subject before the Committee of the House of Commons, spoke handsomely of the services of the volunteers, but gently complained of them for copying his men's helmet. It must have been difficult for Captain Shaw to preserve decorous respect for the Committee when a member of it asked him whether he did not think it would be an advantage to have a number of volunteers who would "take up the question" and stimulate his men to come forward in time. It is one thing to take up a question and another to do a fireman's work. The notion of a race between regulars and volunteers for priority of arrival is slightly ludicrous. The Fire Brigade owes much of its efficiency to exact discipline, and a competition between it and another force excelling rather in zeal than order would probably go far to neutralize the utility of both. There must clearly be a commander of the army which engages the fiery enemy, and we suppose that the volunteers would hardly expect him to be chosen from among themselves. There are places beyond the sphere of action of the Fire Brigade, but yet almost forming part of London, where we believe the services of volunteers have proved highly valuable. In the country, of course, everybody lends a hand with or without a head to guide it. Graduates of Cambridge may remember a time when that town and neighbourhood were remarkable for numerous fires, and an excursion to a blazing farmyard became one of the regular amusements of the winter term. In a country town the custom is, or was, to enter the houses supposed to be in danger and remove the property to any other houses at a safe distance. When leisure came for the reclamation of this property, some pieces perhaps might prove to have gone irreclaimably astray. In London, if you pause near the scene of a fire, a policeman moves you on. In the country, if you do not hasten to give assistance, you are thought to want both courage and humanity. Between town and country lie the districts where volunteers supply more or less the place, and sometimes usurp the uniform, of the Fire Brigade. When Captain Shaw gave his evidence both the strength and the cost of the force which he commands were less than half of that which works excellently in Paris. Probably this proportion has been maintained, although the growth of London calls for more firemen every year. Skilled officers and well-trained men produce astonishing results. They cannot, of course, prevent fires breaking out, but they can and do arrest their progress. Dryden decorously assumed that the personal intervention of King Charles II. helped to stay the progress of the Great Fire of London. But nowadays both Court and city would prefer Captain Shaw to any other leader, however illustrious. It is a comfort to reflect that the Metropolitan Fire Brigade is one of the institutions of the country which nobody abuses at home, and every competent observer from abroad must admire. It owes its origin, as we have shown, to a voluntary association of Insurance Offices, and it is one of the most remarkable monuments of the capacity for organization of Englishmen not employed or impeded by Government.

THE OLD MASTERS AT THE ROYAL ACADEMY.

II.

THE gem of the collection is Raffaelle's "Agony in the Garden" (176). There are pictures more striking in effect, more grand and original in conception, and there are canvases or panels ten, may twenty, times the size; but this little work is in its sphere faultless; we call it a gem because of its purity, its lustre, its perfection. Much might be written concerning the curious history and the matchless art of this representative work, mentioned by Vasari, and described in detail by Passavant. The picture was painted at Urbino about the year 1505; Raffaelle was twenty-one years of age, his father and mother were both dead; he had entered the school of Perugino, had made his first visit to Florence, and then returned for a brief space to his native city in the Umbrian hills, apparently because his good parents had left "his affairs in much confusion." These few biographical details give a clue to the carefully wrought work before us. It belongs to what, with some appearance of paradox, may be termed the pre-Raffaelite period of Raffaelle; in other words, it is almost identical with the works of his master. Indeed Vasari expressly states that at this period Raffaelle imitated with such exactitude the manner of Perugino that the difference between the work of the master and of his pupil could not be discerned with any certainty. "The Agony in the Garden," by Perugino, now in the Belle Arti, Florence, is more than analogous to, for in some parts, especially of the three sleeping Apostles, it is all but identical with, the composition now exhibited. Yet the authenticity of this composition seems established by the words of Vasari, who relates that the youthful Raffaelle, while abiding at Urbino, painted for Duke Guidobaldo "a small picture representing Christ praying in the Garden with three of the Apostles, who are sleeping at some distance, and which is so beautifully painted that it could scarcely be better or otherwise were it even in miniature." When Vasari wrote, the work was treasured as a sacred thing in the Hermitage

of Camaldoli, Urbino; it then passed into the possession of Prince Gabrielli and was long in Rome, whence it was stolen and lost, but at length found in Germany, and, after a law-suit, recovered. In the year 1844 it was acquired by Mr. Woodburn; in the following year it passed into the possession of Mr. Coningham, and is now the property of the present exhibitor, Mr. Fuller Maitland. In the course of these recent changes of ownership it is known to have fetched the sum of 787*l.* 10*s.*, which is at the moderate rate of twenty-five shillings the square inch; under the amazing rise in prices of late years the value must be vastly augmented. The "Garvagh Holy Family" was purchased for the National Gallery at 9,000*l.* which is at the rate of more than 45*s.* to each square inch of panel. The picture now exhibited is, on the whole, in good preservation, yet writers who describe it say that some parts have been ill restored. We have given space to this "Agony in the Garden" because, as we have said, it stands as a representative product; it shows Raffaelle before his great change; it is at the antipodes to his latest work "The Transfiguration" in the Vatican; it retains the simplicity, the earnestness, the devotion which belong to the spiritual school of Umbria. In the Orleans Gallery there was an analogous composition.

In the Venetian school Titian again takes the lead. First comes "The Cornaro Family" (146), a spacious panorama, brilliant as a sunny day, dramatic as a group of richly robed senators on the stage. It would not be quite correct to say that the canvas has been covered carelessly or coarsely, and yet throughout the handling is rapid and broad almost to a fault; indeed some have surmised, though only on slight internal evidence, that Tintoret may have knocked in certain dashing passages. A picture of this somewhat routine character, displaying considerable inequalities, and scarcely in any part, save the two principal heads, rising to the pitch of Titianesque perfection, may well have been committed in a great degree to scholars, of whom Tintoret was one. The style too, as well as the general idea of the composition, bears some analogy to the masterpiece of Veronese, "The Family of Darius," in the National Gallery; so true is it that a school like that of Venice, when firmly established in its principles and practice, is able to produce great works which represent not an individual only but a period, and embody as it were the collective genius of a community. This remark may be further enforced by the "Portrait of an Armed Man in Black" (143), a picture which, though it bears the name of Titian, might equally well be assigned to Morone. In fact, speculations as to the identity of the old masters are as endless as they are interesting; at the present moment criticism tends to scepticism—a reaction no doubt from the credulity which some time past put to the credit of a few great painters the countless products of pupils and imitators. Yet perhaps we cannot be far wrong in placing implicit faith in that lovely little figure, "The Lace-maker" (123). Titian here shows himself the great forerunner of Reynolds; indeed this charming conception might be fitly called "the age of innocence"; the child has the eyes of surprise, the quiet mouse-like manner, the timorousness, the half-awakening consciousness, which give indescribable charm to the children of Reynolds. Titian was never more delicate in pearly grey, not even in the dress of the famous "Flora" in Florence. Close by hangs one of the most slashing of portraits ever assigned to Tintoret (124), and the opposite wall receives decoration from the same exuberant pencil and glowing palette in a highly imaginative rendering of the "Baptism of Christ" (140). The picture was exhibited at Leeds. We have also seen a replica, possibly with variations, in a church at Verona. The composition has the accustomed impetuosity of the master; no genius was ever troubled with such unrest. St. John is of the size of a river god; cherubs rush in where angels fear to tread; the dove struggles in danger through storm clouds. Grand is the glory of the upper sky, and imagination takes free flight through space. We cannot credit Bonifazio—a master rare except in Venice—with the ridiculous medley called "A Pilgrimage to the Temple of Fame" (78). Neither can we inflict on Giorgione "A Lady and Boy of the Morosini Family" (145). Nor is it by any means sure that Paris Bordone could have painted, at least from the life, "Violante, Daughter of Palma Vecchio" (134). Bordone was born in 1500, and the lovely Violante was in her prime between 1516 and 1520. The style is here in the advanced manner of Bordone, who lived up to 1571; the blooming Violante, therefore, in all probability had grown into an old woman at the date of this picture. No head is better known; Palma and Titian again and again painted the lady, sometimes in company with her two sisters. On the whole, we incline to think the figure now on view a free version made by Bordone from Titian. The colouring is that of Bordone when he strove to imitate his second master, Titian, just as the colouring in a notable composition, "A Knight Arm'd" (227), is that of the same master when under the spell of Giorgione. Here the warrior is in grave mood, for he enters on solemn duty, and his comrades await his coming; youth diligently buckles on his armour, and a black page holds his helmet. The canvas has doubtless darkened considerably, and yet we may be sure it was never light; the picture evidently having been carried out, as already said, in emulation of the more shadowy conceptions of Giorgione, wherein light loses itself in obscurity, and colour is mysteriously veiled as if glowing out of half-hidden depths. Colour so treated has great significance; it becomes expressive of thought and responsive to emotion.

Some interesting Spanish pictures come from the collection of the late Mr. Richard Ford, the well-known author of the Hand-

book which opened the Peninsula to English tourists. No man has written in a smarter way of Spanish art; we often have occasion to refer to his keen-sighted judgments. That the five pictures now exhibited prove a little disappointing may in some measure arise from the deplorable condition into which they have fallen. Of historic importance are the two portraits (116, 125), by Velasquez, of the first and second wives of Philip IV. The first scarcely bears out, we think, the words of Sir William Stirling-Maxwell:—"The beautiful Queen Isabella de Bourbon—Elizabeth of France, daughter of Henry IV. and sister of our Henrietta Maria—the first wife of Philip IV., was the star of the Court, and the loveliest subject of the pencil of Velasquez." And the exhaustive Catalogue to the "Annals" makes no mention of the picture now exhibited; it possibly is a replica. Mariana of Austria, the second Queen of Philip IV. (125), was, we are told, "a gay princess, prone to vex her solemn lord with girlish laughter"; the King, it is said, was never known to smile but three times in his life, which may account for the solemnity of his face whenever it appears in picture galleries. The portrait of the second Queen, now before us, was formerly in the Royal Palace at Madrid; it subsequently fell into the possession of General Meade, at whose sale in London in 1847 it was purchased for thirteen guineas—another proof of how vastly prices have changed within the last quarter of a century. From the collection of the Earl of Radnor come two noble figures which again show Velasquez the greatest of portrait-painters. To both works interesting stories attach. "Juan de Pareja" (141) was an intelligent, bright-eyed mulatto, with thick nose and lips, and curling black hair. At first he was the slave of Velasquez; he cleaned the brushes, ground the colours, set the palettes, and swept out the studio. But at length he learned to use the brushes he washed, and the King one day, discovering in the painting-room a picture by the poor colour-grinder, turned to Velasquez, and said, "You see that a painter like this ought not to remain a slave." Velasquez immediately gave to his faithful servant freedom, together with all the educational advantages of his studio. We know of two very creditable works by Pareja, severally in the Galleries of Madrid and St. Petersburg. "The calling of St. Matthew" in the former contains the artist's own portrait. We dwell on these biographical incidents because Pareja, whose swarthy physiognomy we have now the opportunity of studying, is the only historic indication that a mulatto and a slave is capable of becoming an artist of renown. Yet Pareja was little more than a copyist; his portraits, in fact, are so far imitations as to have been mistaken for the work of Velasquez. Of no less interest in the story of Spanish art is the portrait of Admiral Pareja (149), also by Velasquez. The picture is said to have been painted with brushes of unusual length, and certainly the figure tells with amazing power and life-like presence at unusual distance. It is related that Philip IV., taking his accustomed lounge through the painting room where the full-length portrait stood, exclaimed, "What, still here my admiral!" and receiving no reply, turned to Velasquez and said, "I assure you I was taken in." "Signing the Marriage Contract between the Infanta Margarita Maria, daughter of Philip IV., and the Emperor Leopold" (86), seems doubtful; possibly the figure of the Infanta is a first rubbing in by the master. A more veritable work, though not mentioned by Sir William Stirling-Maxwell, is "A Woman making an Omelette" (92). The intense realism and individualism in detail and in character place this life-like scene in the same category with "The Water Sellers" in Apsley House. The pictures of Murillo, though professedly six in number, are of comparatively slight worth; "Ruth and Naomi" (152) is the best, and undoubtedly genuine. We cannot close the Spanish school without directing attention to an impressive work, "Christ Bearing the Cross" (104), a signed canvas by Francisco Ribalta, a painter of Valencia, who formed his style in Italy under the posthumous influence of Raffaelle. But Spanish artists emulate Italian painters with a difference; they are uniformly dark, draped, and devotional; and such is the aspect of this "Christ" heavily laden under the burden of the Cross. It were interesting to compare, by means of engravings, photographs, or otherwise, the picture now exhibited with the analogous work in the chapel of Magdalen College, Oxford—a composition which, under the absolute ignorance which in England formerly prevailed even in high places, has been successively assigned to Titian, Ludovico Carracci, Guido, Morales, and one of the two Ribaltas. The signature to the picture now in the Academy, if it can be established as veritable, may go far to solve these historic perplexities.

Rubens is so well known, and has been so often passed under review, that the examples here presented need not detain us long. "The Artist's Son" (74) is better seen in Dresden; also in the same Gallery is a bacchanal scene superior to "Diana returning from the Chase" (207). Space, however, must be afforded for "Daniel in the Lions' Den" (131). That this master-work is not by Snyders, as some have asserted, may be easily proved by comparison with "The Boar Hunt" (80), in the adjoining room. The handling of Rubens is free, liquid, and sketchy; the execution of Snyders, on the contrary, is hard, mechanical, and laboured. Besides, apart from internal evidence, "we know with certainty," writes Dr. Waagen, "that Rubens executed this picture entirely himself," the evidence being a letter written from Antwerp, wherein the painter says, "Daniel amidst many lions, taken from the life—original; the whole by my hand." Rubens is known as almost unrivalled in the delineation of animals; Sir

Edwin Landseer is not his superior in action and in power. The two artists have measured their strength within the walls of the Academy; and the verdict is, that the lions of Landseer are tame, while the lions of Rubens are wild, angry, and ferocious as absolute monarchs of the forest. They grandly prowl around the terrified prophet; indeed Daniel serves but as an excuse for throwing the ravenous beasts into dramatic action.

REVIEWS.

GUBERNATIS'S ZOOLOGICAL MYTHOLOGY.*

SOME little while ago the *Edinburgh Review* passed sentence of death on the so-called science of Comparative Mythology, and uttered a solemn warning against all the dreadful results which would inevitably follow from the adoption of its pernicious principles. Setting aside the plea that the genius of great poets is shown most of all in their power of transmuting the poorest materials into gold, and that their truthfulness and force in the analysis and description of human feelings are not only not called into question, but are indefinitely enhanced, if it should be proved that the rude forms hewn by them into shapes so exquisite really exhibited little or nothing of deep human feeling, the reviewer, speaking on behalf of Homer and *Aeschylus*, of Shakspeare and Milton, laid his ban on all attempts to reduce to mythical phrases the stories of Helen and Achilleus, of Paris and Hektor. A process which called itself scientific and which might possibly invade even the sacred circle of the dramas of Shakspeare was more than flesh and blood could bear; and the ease with which the process might be applied to some at least of Shakspeare's plays was without any misgiving insisted on as a conclusive reason for summarily rejecting the upstart science:—

Othello [the reviewer ironically argued] is obviously a solar hero, and to the enlightened comparative mythologist the whole tragedy is a transparent solar myth. Some short-sighted critics have indeed supposed that Shakspeare meant to represent in this tragedy the working of human passions such as jealousy and revenge. But this is a complete mistake arising from the non-recognition of the Vedic element which constitutes the essence of all real tragedy.

The science, in short, was by the confession of its upholders a mass of absurdities. The mythical beings of the Vedic hymns were not only vague and shadowy, but both they and their attributes were interchangeable. Professor Max Müller had himself admitted that the same God is sometimes regarded as supreme, sometimes as equal, sometimes as inferior to others, and no sane man would waste time on material so worthless. The supposition that the subject and framework of poems so full of human feeling as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* could have been furnished by phrases which described originally the phenomena of the heaven and the earth drew down even a more severe censure. It was urged that physical phenomena are, and always were, destitute of those elements of interest which must lie at the root of every great poem; and the notion of dramatizing a law of nature was dismissed as absurd and self-contradictory.

If this hard knock could slay the new science, it was perhaps well that the blow should be given; but the assertion of its apparent absurdity as a conclusive ground for condemning it lost somewhat of its force for those whose thoughts turned to the history of astronomy; while the absurdity of dramatizing a law of nature ceased to impress those who remembered that the notion of laws of nature had in the mythopoetic ages no existence, and that the supposed lack of interest in physical phenomena is contradicted by many of the most splendid or most touching poems of the greatest poets whether of England or of any other country. Time, it would seem, is already beginning to work its revenge; and the very ark of the Shakspearian drama has been touched by scholars who are not comparative mythologists, and who do not even profess to be mythologists at all. Such students have not been afraid to say that, for some at least of his plays, Shakspeare employed materials obtained from the great storehouse of Aryan myths, and that the drama for the framework of which he is most indebted to these myths is the one marked perhaps beyond all others for the play of the truest and deepest of human feelings—*Hamlet*. The fact that Shakspeare worked from a German model, and that in this model the mythical origin of the story is clearly brought out, cannot be put out of sight; and the shadowy nature of the hero himself has been exhibited most forcibly by a writer who, seeking only to ascertain how far Hamlet belongs to a family which had an historical existence, found that almost every name with which he is connected is the subject of myths common to most or all branches of the Aryan race, that the method of Hamlet's death agrees precisely with that of his father, and that the incidents are found in many other stories of mythical heroes. The diggers in this field may seem to approach perilously near to Othello; but whatever may be the fate of the swarthy Moor and his fair-haired love, the framework of another play of the great English dramatist has in the meanwhile been traced to distant lands and ages by an Italian scholar in a work which marks another stage in the history of mythological research. In the stories of Dirghatainas and Yatatis, Professor Angelo de Gubernatis discerns King Lear in

* *Zoological Mythology; or, Legends of Animals.* By Angelo de Gubernatis, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Literature in the Istituto di Studii Superiori at Florence. London: Trübner. 1872.

embryo. Cordelia is here the third son, who consents to become old in his father's stead when his two elder brothers refuse, or, in another version, the youngest child who remains with his parents when these have been driven from their home by the elder children.

But the real significance of this very able work lies elsewhere. It is not our intention to pronounce definitely whether the conclusions of the author are right or wrong; but we may acknowledge at the outset the vast learning and the patient care with which he has accumulated and classified in these remarkable volumes a vast store of materials, and the vigour which may carry the reader through his whole book with almost unflagging interest. By first publishing his work in an English dress, which only in a few stray words or expressions betrays the fact that we are reading a translation, Professor Gubernatis has chosen to address himself chiefly to English scholars; and it will not speak well either for their patience or for their impartiality if they fail to weigh carefully the evidence here brought before them. This evidence may be said to bear practically on one point, that point being the one on which for some time past the whole controversy on the comparative theory has been turning. With the *Edinburgh Reviewer* the flexibility of the materials said to be employed in the formation of myths was a sufficient reason for rejecting as absurd the conclusions of comparative mythologists, and for denying the possibility of the science. With Professor Gubernatis this flexibility alone renders the existence of myths possible; and, to say the least, the reader who has gone through these volumes must feel himself almost overwhelmed by the vast array of facts which he must pass under review before he can attempt to reject the proposition as unproven. The author's task has been to deal first, not with the great epic poems and epic heroes and actors, whether of the Eastern or Western world, but with the vast multitude of beasts, birds, and fishes which figure in those poems and traditions. This strange throng, which exhibits innumerable shapes, beautiful or grotesque, graceful or disgusting, lovely or fearful, is most numerous in the Vedic and post-Vedic literature of India. But if we call to mind a few only of the old Greek myths, we shall see at once how large a part these creatures play in them; and yet probably until the question is forced on their notice, not many will have thought it a matter calling for any serious thought. Yet we can scarcely be justified in dismissing it in any offhand fashion, when we have the eagle of Zeus and the owl of Athéné, the horses of Achilleus and Poseidon, the ass of Seilenos and the ass's ears of Midas, when we find Athéné changing herself at will into a bird, and Io changed into an heifer, when we see the boar in the stories of Atys, Adonis, Meleagros, and Odysseus, the terrible Minotauros in the myth of Theseus, and the fine breathing bulls in that of Medea. In short, we soon learn that there is scarcely a myth in which bird, beast, or fish may not be found. In the Homeric hymn Apollon throws himself into the sea in the form of a dolphin, and, having guided the Cretan ship to the shores of Kria, comes out from the waters like a star. In the story of Aristaos the fish-god is seen as the preacher of wisdom, and as a deliverer in that of Arion. As to serpents and dragons, they are everywhere—as noxious beasts in the myths of Phoibos, Kadmos, or Herakles, and in beneficent aspects in the stories of Iamos and Melampus. Dionysos can change himself into a bear or a lion; Lykaon is changed, against his will, into a wolf; Arachne into a spider; Philomela and Prokno into the nightingale and the swallow. The golden ram carries Phrixos and Helle from the land of Athamas; the three-headed dog guards the gates of Hades. Nay, we have strange unions between Leda and the swan, and heroes and heroines hatched from eggs, with horrible associations between men and horses or other beasts; and not only have we the marvellous changes by which Apollon and Athéné appear as crows, and Talao as a partridge, but for many of these transformations, or for the manifestation of them, the times are definitely marked. In many cases, of two closely connected beings one only may be seen at a time; in many others, one change passes rapidly into another, like the uncertain colours of a dream. It is only on comparing the Greek myths or traditions with those of other nations or races that our eyes are opened to the enormous range of this mythological zoology. Birds, beasts, reptiles, insects, fishes, here live in a world of their own, reflecting in greater or less degree the forms and habits of the animals of earth, yet never wholly like them; and thus we find ourselves in a labyrinth seemingly inextricable. So tangled is the wilderness and so strange are the creatures which inhabit it, that we may be tempted to look on the task of classification as one beyond human powers, until we see that the mythical zoology of the most distant nations has many, and these the most striking, features in common, and that, if this zoology be the growth of a diseased imagination, all nations have gone mad in precisely the same way, and there is therefore a method in their madness. What we are made to feel most forcibly is that, on whatever theory we are to explain the fact, the world into which we are introduced exhibits a series of incessantly and rapidly shifting scenes, in which the same objects, from different points of view, appear brilliant or dark, lovely or appalling. In short, the phenomena which we have to note are characterized by that flexibility which is so especially distasteful to critics like the writer in the *Edinburgh Review*. In this characteristic Professor Gubernatis sees the condition without which no myth would ever have come into existence. The myths which have branched off into the largest number of legends are, in his judgment, those which are founded on the most fleeting phenomena:—

The continuous succession of shadows, penumbras, chiaroscuri, and shades

of light, from the black darkness to the silver moon, from the silver moon to the grey twilight of morning, which gradually melts into and confounds itself with the dawn, from the dawn to the aurora, from the aurora to the sun; the same variations occurring, but inversely, in the evening, from the dying sun to the reddish and blood-coloured sky or evening aurora, from the evening aurora to the grey twilight, from the grey twilight to the silver moon, from the silver moon to the gloomy night—this continual change of colours which meet, unite with, and pass into, each other, originated the idea of celestial companions, friends, or relations, who are now in union and now separate, who now approach to love each other, to move together and affectionately follow each other, now rush upon each other to fight, despoil, betray, and destroy each other turn by turn, who now attract and are now attracted, are now seduced and now seducers, now cheated and now deceivers, now victims, now sacrificers.—I. 320.

In the lives of these companions, friends, rivals, or enemies, the birds, beasts, fishes, reptiles, and insects of the mythical world each fulfil a special office. Nay, these friends or enemies may themselves assume and again throw off these animal forms, and beasts are supposed to go through courses of action which are possible only for a man. The god Hanumant, the son of the bull of the wind, appearing himself both as a bull and as an ape, receives as a reward from the King Bharatas a hundred thousand cows, sixteen wives, and a hundred servant-maids. As bull or ape, what, Professor Gubernatis asks, could he have done with them?—

It is these inconsistencies [he adds] which have caused mythology to be condemned by the crowd of old but prolific pedants as a vain science, whereas, on the contrary, it is precisely these inconsistencies which raise it, in our esteem, to the rank of a valid science. He who handed down to us the feats of Hanumant took care also to tell us how he had the faculty of changing his form at will; and this faculty, attributed to this impersonation of a celestial phenomenon, is the fruit of one of the most *naïve* but just observations of virgin and grandiose nature.—I. 90.

This sentence may not accurately represent the author's meaning; but the defects of translation (and in these volumes they are few indeed) cannot invalidate his claim to a hearing; and this hearing he challenges for a proposition which certainly cannot be charged with being either indefinite or indistinct. His first book bears the title of "Animals of the Earth," the second of "Animals of the Air," the third of "Animals of the Water"; but he holds that there is but one domain in which all the animals of mythology are produced and play their several parts:—

This domain is always the heavens, whilst the time during which the mythical action lasts is subject to many variations, being now the day of twelve hours; now that of twenty-four; now the three watches of the night; at one time the lunar month of twenty-seven days, at another the solar month of thirty; sometimes the year of twelve solar, and sometimes that of thirteen lunar, months.—I. p. xvi.

When to these variations are added the changes of phase incessantly going on in the heavens, we seem to lose ourselves in a boundless region where the human imagination may run riot without check. It remains to be seen whether the innumerable images thus produced may be brought into order, and whether the classifications yield results which may be regarded as adequate foundations for a science. For the present we will only remark that, as furnishing materials for the comparative mythologist, the Slavonic traditions are placed by Professor Gubernatis above the Greek. The former in his belief have undergone no change for perhaps three thousand years, while the Tatar himself, a great teller of stories, only increased the taste of the Slavonic peasant for tales, and did not change his legends or his character. In short, the Tatar stories, he maintains, are the Aryan tales themselves, only a little modified by a few Tatar peculiarities. The reader who may wish to see how far the judgment of Professor Gubernatis is confirmed by an independent witness, will find a large amount of mythical zoology in Mr. Rawson's *Songs of the Russian People*.

A LADY OF THE LAST CENTURY.*

IN spite of our self-complacent sense of progress, there is one quality in which we are forced to own ourselves falling short of our forefathers. We cannot read the social history of the last century without feeling that they beat us hollow in the article of vivacity. And this is an admission which carries us further than at first seems, or than is altogether agreeable; for can wit exist without it? It is this quality which makes book-making out of eighteenth-century biography easy writing, and, when written, easy reading. It is not new; we are sure, in fact, that we have read it all somewhere before; but we find ourselves in cheerful company. We open upon a page when society was young—"Ah, woful when!"—and people knew how to entertain each other; and we are entertained at second-hand, though saddened by the contrast, as we range over our acquaintance—able and well informed people probably, but not lively; or we more reasonably ask, each one of himself, Falkland's question—Am I the life of the company? which each member of the historical circle was in his turn.

The heroine of Dr. Doran's present book, *A Lady of the Last Century*, is a typical representative of this distinguishing quality. Vivacity, as the characteristic of an age, is a vigorous thing, implying strength—strength of body, mind, and nerve. The vivacious ladies who figure in the history of the period lived long and actively; they danced, they talked, they wrote, they managed their households, and were quite equal to guide themselves and their affairs, and as long as they lived they enjoyed a good laugh. Pre-eminent for this liveliness

* *A Lady of the Last Century: Mrs. Elizabeth Montagu*. Illustrated by her Unpublished Letters. By Dr. Doran. London: Bentley & Son. 1873.

and buoyancy of spirit stands Mrs. Montagu, who on this account alone deserves to be resuscitated by a new volume in her honour. As a child she bandied repartees with her father till he retired discomfited from the contest; her "elegant vivacity" is the theme of her friends, to whom her variety was a constant surprise; her letters are full of spirited comment and happy turns. She carried all she had learnt at her tongue's end. Her conversation won the highest praise from Dr. Johnson for its life:—"That lady exerts more *mind* in conversation than any person I ever met with. Sir, she displays such powers of ratiocination and radiations of intellectual eminence as are amazing." And this vigour and sprightliness lasted her through a long life.

It may be that the deeper and wider view of responsibility enforced upon society, at least in words, by teachers of all schools in our day, is a salutary check on minds open to such influences. We do not pretend to put forward this cheerful, prosperous lady as an example to her sex; it might have been for her good now and then to let the troubles of the world take a stronger hold of her heart and fancy than they seem to have done. She represents an age which did not affect deep views; the inequalities of human society were a fact which it did not feel called on to rectify on a subversive scale. Her rule of conduct marks the prevailing tone:—"My business is to make the best of things as they are"—and "things" certainly arranged themselves with an extraordinary eye to her convenience. But she had the art of making her convenience fall in with the general happiness, as Hannah More's testimony, written some years after her death, shows:—"Her fine qualities were many; from my first entrance into London life till her death I ever found her an affectionate, zealous, and constant friend, as well as a most instructive and pleasant companion." She had a temper to make the most of her gifts; it helped her to a career; which even beauty, birth, health, wit, and wealth, without it, are not enough to win for a woman. Even her errors were lucky; they were follies and affectations, not faults of temper or more fatal imprudences in business or conduct, the usual pitfalls of a brilliant fortune. It is not Dr. Doran's part to describe these affectations, but they were so far of the nature of "Queen Elizabeth's" foibles that they never interfered with her main interests. A strong sense was the basis of her character, regulating all the leading actions of her life. As a beauty and wit, she endured the crucial test of a crowd of lovers, from whom she chose a rich commoner of good birth and understanding and great wealth, to whom she made a good wife, though his death certainly cast no lasting gloom on her spirits. He left her his whole fortune and estates. These estates she managed with a vigilant prudence apart from meanness and suspicion. She manifests a remarkable enjoyment in possession. The word *my* is as conspicuous in her letters as the "I" of egotism in some people's. But *my* tenants, *my* agent, *my* labourers, *my* colliers, *my* servants, all gain by the connexion with herself, and are good of their kind. Even building on a large scale (her mansion in Portman Square) does not disturb this complacency. "If it were not that a house must be building before it can be built, I should never have been a builder," but "I have never had a quarter of an hour's pain or pleasure in the operation. I have not met with the least disappointment or mortification. It has gone on as fast and well as I expected, and when it is habitable I shall take great pleasure in it." Not even pay-day tries her equanimity. She owns a wonderful charm in "a receipt" *in full of all demands*, and "my house never appeared to me so noble, so splendid, so pleasant, so convenient, as when I had paid off every shilling of debt it had incurred." She finds the same enjoyment in the achievements of the "celebrated Mr. Brown" ("Capability Brown"), who lays out the grounds of her country house:—"As fast as time wrinkles my forehead I smooth the grounds about Sandleford, or embellish my town habitation. In a little while I shall never see anything belonging to me that is not pretty, except when I behold my face in the looking-glass."

This was written in 1779, and the writer was born in 1720. It tells much for the quality of her vivacity that it should thus have stood the wear and tear of all but threescore years. The letters which give the occasion for this volume are of a later date than any yet published, taking up her correspondence at the date 1761, where the two previous series of her letters end. One of these was published by her nephew and heir, Matthew Montagu, in 1808, when they won Windham's warm praise for variety of thought and ease and sparkle of style; and the next was universally well received in 1813. The last forty years of her life have remained unrecorded until this publication of a correspondence with her sister-in-law Mrs. Robinson, and other friends, bought years ago at a sale of autographs by Mr. R. Bentley. It retains all the qualities of her earlier style, and, as a record of the sayings and doings of fine people just a hundred years ago, furnishes some pages of pleasant, suggestive light reading to our sadder, and it is therefore assumed wiser, generation.

When people are called affected by their friends there is no doubt something in it, though our own observation leads to the paradox that some persons are naturally affected. Vivacity often incurs the charge. The impulse to express oneself and entertain others becomes a habit, and habit does not always wait for the inspiration of the moment. Mrs. Montagu's elegant vivacity was probably often forced; but it is to be added that she hit out new modes while her friends were content with well-worn affectations. On referring to Mrs. Delany's correspondence, it is amusing to find Mrs. Boscowen, in a jargon of mixed French and English, commenting on "the sketch you gave me of Madame de Montagu,

'qui n'est que trop ressemblante,' and much I fear that she will never be Mrs. Montagu again! I wish she would learn by heart her friend Mrs. Chapone's chapter on simplicity, which surely is a better thing than egotism or boasting, or affectation of any kind; but how little temptation has she to affect anything when she has such natural endowments! but so it is, and I own I apprehend qu'elle reviendra de ces courses *tout-à-fait gâtée*." This was the tone of the day; but when Mrs. Montagu, to express that she had shut herself up for one whole day from interruption, called herself "hermetically sealed," the phrase was treasured for repetition by Horace Walpole. It was clearly a new idea to introduce scientific terms into everyday language. The courage of this lady was one of her striking qualities, whether in the choice of a word or of an antagonist. When Voltaire attacked Shakspeare, she wrote an essay in defence of our poet which had an immense success, though Johnson's surly judgment—"I will venture to say there is not one sentence of true criticism in the book"—is likely enough to be true. And her tongue was as ready as her pen. When she was told that Voltaire had boasted, "C'est moi qui autrefois parlai le premier de ce Shakspeare. C'est moi qui le premier montrai aux Français quelques perles que j'avais trouvées dans son fumier," she charged him at once with plagiarizing from this dunghill:—"Ah! c'est un fumier qui a fertilisé une terre bien ingrate." And later, when she was present at the Academy at the reading of a furious paper against Shakspeare by Voltaire, and a Frenchman, affecting to pity her confusion under the blow to her countryman's fame, said, "I think, madam, you must be rather sorry at what you have just heard," she promptly replied, "I, sir! not at all. I am not one of M. Voltaire's friends."

Among the humours of that day was the giving of names to the familiar members of each high circle. And Mrs. Montagu in her bright girlhood was styled Fidget by her friend the Duchess of Portland, in recognition of her great activity of mind and body. She took to the title. Speaking of an old-fashioned table, she wrote, "Why so many legs should be required to stand still whilst I can fidget upon two, I own surprises me." Wherever she went she kept her observation on the alert, and was uttering sayings which were quoted by her friends. Thus she pronounced Spa, where she was staying with a bevy of wits, "The Seven Dials of Europe." At Utrecht she is amazed at the stolidity of the Dutch exterior, and "had never had any complete idea of what was meant by stock still" till she came to Holland. Bath life she described as consisting all the morning of "How d'y'e does?" and all the night "What's trumps?" One of the over-dressed ladies at Tonbridge "is a state bed running on casters." Writing from Yorkshire, where the vice of drinking prevailed, she says, "I do honestly thank my stars that I am not married to a country squire or a beau; for in the country all my pleasure is in my own fireside, and that only when it is not littered with queer creatures. Could you but see all the good folks that visit my poor tabernacle, your grace would pity and admire." This, however, is an extract from her earlier correspondence. Satire is a youthful foible. She grows in good nature as she gets older. We read elsewhere her reflections on the changes time brings:—"I cannot say that as one grows older one grows so much wiser as to despise foolish amusements, but one likes new kinds of follies. I mean one always likes some of those things severe and frowning wisdom calls follies." But her sympathy with the pleasures of the young never failed. The following upon minuets throws a light upon the feelings of our forefathers:—

I approve much of your getting up a dance once a week for the young folks, and I am particularly glad my nephew is of the party. Grace of person is of more consequence to a woman than a man; but the capacity for dancing a minuet is more serviceable to a young man; for, by so doing he obliges many young ladies, while the minuet miss seldom pleases any girl but herself. Unless a girl is very beautiful, very well shaped, and very gentle, she gives little pleasure to the spectators of her minuet; and indeed so unpolite are the sitters-by in all assemblies, that they express a most ungrateful joy when the minuets are over. For my part, though I feel as great envy as my neighbours on those occasions, I never allow myself to appear so; for I look upon a minuet to be generally an act of filial piety, which gives real pleasure to fathers, mothers, and aunts. . . . In France good minuets are clapped; but I believe no nation arrived at such a degree of civilization as to *encore* them.

A full appreciation of the good things of life and their uses gives a point to gossip in her hands. "There is a report," she writes, "that Captain Darby is going to be married to a widow with fourscore thousand pounds. It seems her first husband was a good-humoured, quiet, dull man. Elle s'en trouvait bien, and is going to take such another; but still, fourscore thousand pounds is a great price for a dull man." In 1772 we find her visiting Mr. and Mrs. Burke, and regretting that she can only afford one day; for when "the talents of a man of genius, the acuteness of a politician, the alert vivacity of a man of business, are all employed to make conversation agreeable and society pleasant, one passes one's time very delightfully in such company"; and it is clear that in her presence every one talked his best.

At Beaconsfield Mr. Burke is an industrious farmer, a polite husband, a kind master, a charitable neighbour, and a most excellent companion. The demons of ambition and party who hover about Westminster, do not extend their influence as far as the villa. I know not why it is, but these busy spirits seem more tranquil and pleased in their days of retreat than the honest dull justice of the quorum, who never stretched forth his hand to snatch the sceptre of power, or raised his voice in public to fill the trumpet of fame. A little mind is for ever in a tracasserie, because it is moved by little things. I have always found that nothing is so gentle as the chief out of war, nor so serene and simple as the statesman out of place. But with all her appreciation of great men, she and Johnson did

not hit it. He irritated her by his criticism of her great friend Lord Lyttelton's poems, and by the epithet "poor Lyttelton!" which he did not remove at her objection; and probably, in spite of the homage of many fine compliments, sincere when he uttered them, there was something about her that irritated him. His candour shines out in the following passage:—

Notwithstanding this offence, Mrs. Montagu subsequently invited Johnson to dinner, but she could not treat him with her old cordiality, nor would she fall into conversation with him. General Paoli sat next to the Doctor. Johnson turned to him and remarked, "You see, sir, I am no longer the man for Mrs. Montagu!" He was not indifferent to this condition of things. "Mrs. Montagu, sir," he afterwards said to a friend, "has dropped me. Now, sir, there are people whom one should like very well to drop, but would not wish to be dropped."

We find casual allusions to politics, especially in the letters of Mrs. Scott, Mrs. Montagu's sister, and extremely like her in person and mind. The fine ladies of that day allowed themselves a freedom of speech which Dr. Doran scruples to perpetuate in his heroine; but Lady Townsend is permitted to express her opinion of public events in her own way. Thus, of the creation of peers soon after George III.'s accession, "You will find few commoners in England. We make nobility as fast as people make kings and queens in Twelfth-night, and almost as many. Lady Townsend says, she dare not spit out of her window, for fear of spitting on a lord." Mrs. Montagu was really too grand and too rich to be only and simply a fine lady. The dignity of landed property gave her nobler interests. She speculates on the condition of the labouring class, and wished to mend it:—"I have forty reapers at work, to take advantage of the fine weather. I brewed seven hogsheads of small beer for them, and fear it will not last till the end of harvest. The poor reapers and haymakers bring nothing but water into the fields, which, with bad cheese and fine white bread, is their general fare. I think our Northern people are much more notable. Their meals are more plentiful and less delicate; they eat coarse bread, and drink a great deal of milk, and have often salt beef." These Northern people have improved their fare since this was written. The Yorkshire reaper has now his three meals of meat a day at his master's expense. In a letter of the year 1762 we find a curious illustration of the political fever of that date caricatured in Murphy's farce of the *Upholsterer*. "The lowest artificer," writes Mrs. Montagu, "thinks now of nothing but the constitution of the Government. If you order a mason to build an oven, he immediately inquires about the progress of the peace, and descants on the preliminaries."

Of Dr. Doran's editorship there is not much to be said. The times which his book illustrates have been so long and so curiously sought into that we ought not to complain if we seem to have read some of his pages before. The book has enough interest to lead the reader on at whatever page he opens, and he will scarcely lay it down without the reflection that the eighteenth century understood the art of amusing itself in a degree which the nineteenth century has lost.

STEPHEN'S EDITION OF THE INDIAN EVIDENCE ACT.*

THERE is no reason to suppose that the Indian Evidence Act, of which an edition has just been published in this country by Mr. Fitzjames Stephen, with a remarkable Introduction, could be at once transferred to the English Statute-book; but it may furnish some valuable lessons to English lawyers and legislators. The minority (it is to be feared the small minority) of the English legal profession and of the English public who take an interest in the subject appear to have now abandoned the idea that there would be any material advantage in having a Digest of the English law prepared, and they seem to be agreed that what is wanted is a Code. A Digest is here understood as a re-statement of the law in consecutive propositions, possessing no authority except that which belongs to its framers; a Code is a re-statement of the same nature invested with the authority of a legislative enactment. But this Indian experiment clearly shows that a Chapter on Evidence in an English Code which should be nothing more than an enacted Digest would be in the highest degree unsatisfactory, and indeed grotesque. The labour of thinking out the first principles of each branch of the law, of stating them intelligibly, and of basing on them an orderly arrangement of the whole subject, cannot in fact be saved or avoided. It is very easy to show to what extent this assertion is true of the English law of evidence. Any statement of the law which servilely followed the method of a Digest would begin by laying down that (1) all facts which supplied inferences of any sort regarding the matter in dispute might be put in evidence, and then it would proceed to lay down the exceptions to this general rule. One of these exceptions would be that (2) the statements of persons not called as witnesses, which they have made to others, cannot be received as evidence; and to this last rule there would be one further exception among others, in the case of (3) statements made by a person since dead concerning the cause of his death. Now it happens that the great bulk of the English law of evidence consists of rules belonging to the class to which rule (3) belongs, and therefore, if framed on the principles of which we are speaking, the chapter of the Code which dealt with evidence would declare the law to consist of a number of sub-exceptions to

exceptions to a general rule. The clumsiness and inconvenience of such a method require no demonstration, and it is a palpable merit of the Indian Evidence Act that it at least cuts the chain down from three links to two. It considers facts, in their relation to other facts, as possessing a quality which it calls "relevancy," and which is capable of description in general language. The "relevancy" of facts is their capacity for supplying to the mind an inference concerning the existence or non-existence of other facts. The most important part of the Act consists of rules for defining and determining the "relevancy" of various classes of facts, and to these rules the exceptions are comparatively few. And of all such rules the widest and most important are those contained in Sections 7 and 11:—

Facts which are the occasion, cause, or effect, immediate or otherwise, of relevant facts, or facts in issue, or which constitute the state of things under which they happened, or which afforded an opportunity for their occurrence or transaction, are relevant. . . . Facts not otherwise relevant are relevant if they are inconsistent with any fact in issue or relevant fact, or, if by themselves or in connexion with other facts, they make the existence or non-existence of any fact in issue, or relevant fact, highly probable or improbable.

A very recent critic of the new Indian law has objected to the above provision, and to others of equal width, that, from their extreme generality, and from the difficulty of applying them, they are calculated to leave in the hands of the judge a practically unlimited power of admitting or rejecting evidence. The observation curiously illustrates the habit of mind produced in English lawyers by the mode of argument of which the accustomed form is, "My lord, your lordship will find that similar evidence was admitted (or rejected) in *Jones v. Smith*." But the truth is, it is altogether wide of the point. The Indian Evidence Act is intended for application in India, and Sir H. Maine, in a paper just published in the *Fortnightly Review*, has clearly shown why an explicit statement of the law in general propositions was urgently needed in that country. The Indian judge is judge both of law and of fact, and the power left in his hands is a power over the formation of his own mental conclusions. It is fairly arguable that a judge in such a position might be left unshackled by any law of evidence; but such a liberty would be practically irreconcilable with the correction of decisions by Courts of Appeal, and would be especially liable to abuse in a country in which an officer of Government is occasionally compelled, in political emergencies, to attach importance to the merest rumours. What was obviously needed was to relieve the judge from the necessity of estimating the value of objections founded on a reference to "*Jones v. Smith*," of which no report was perhaps accessible within a thousand miles distance, and to prevent the conclusions of the only man who had been in personal contact with the witnesses from being overruled by an Appellate Court as irreconcilable with technical rules to which he had practically no access. We can easily understand, too, that, as the *Fortnightly* asserts, the enforced obedience to a system of rules which English lawyers pick up as they go, and apply by a sort of knack, was exercising an enfeebling influence on the minds of a service which, at critical times, has to act under circumstances when nobody but a fool or pedant would dream of estimating probabilities by a technical rule.

The Act itself, most instructive as it is, must doubtless undergo considerable alteration before it can be made to serve as the Chapter on Evidence in the English Code; but the Introduction which Mr. Stephen has prefixed to it deserves to be studied by all beginners in the Law of Evidence, whatever form be given to it, and ought to interest a much larger class. Among the few books which have been written in our language on the theory of judicial evidence, there is hardly a good one. The one which has most reputation is the work of the late Mr. Best, of which Lord Wensleydale is said to have observed that more thought had been put into it than into any law-book he knew. If this praise was deserved, we are afraid we must assert that a great deal of the thought was wasted, as indeed was not a little of that which passed through the powerful mind of Lord Wensleydale himself. For Mr. Best nowhere shows that he apprehended the truth which Mr. Stephen has firmly grasped—the identity in principle of judicial and of inductive scientific investigation. The general problem both of science and of judicial inquiry is to discover, collect, and arrange true propositions about facts. "Facts," Mr. Stephen argues, are sufficiently described by the definitions of the Indian Evidence Act, in which a "fact" is (1) any thing, state of things, or relation of things capable of being perceived by the senses; and (2) any mental condition of which any person is conscious. A proposition, he continues, is "a collection of words so related as to raise in the minds of those who understand them a corresponding group of images or thoughts"; and a true proposition is "one which excites in the mind thoughts or images corresponding to those which would be excited in the mind of a person so situated as to be able to perceive the facts to which the proposition relates." How then are we to proceed in order to ascertain whether any given proposition about facts is true, and in order to frame true propositions about facts? After stating that the facts must first be correctly observed, and then be recorded in apt language, and justly insisting on the delicacy and difficulty, little as they are usually recognized, of both these operations, Mr. Stephen goes on to show that the method of applying observation and language to inquiries into matters of fact in the court of justice and in the study or laboratory is identical. It is constituted in both cases by the processes of induction and deduction. A fixed order is

* *The Indian Evidence Act*. With an Introduction on the Principles of Judicial Evidence, by James Fitzjames Stephen, Esq., Q.C. London: Macmillan & Co. Calcutta: Thacker & Co. 1872.

first recognized both in nature and human conduct, and according to this order certain things are invariably related together as antecedents and consequents. What particular consequents are thus related to what particular antecedents is established by induction; and, in the case of human conduct, not by direct observation, but by the processes called by Mr. Mill the Methods of Agreement and Difference. The general proposition established by induction is used as a premiss from which consequences are drawn according to the rules of logic, and the inference, as to what must follow under particular circumstances, is compared with the facts observed; and if the result observed agrees with the deduction from the inductive premiss, the inference is that the phenomenon is explained. The explanation is equally valid whether the movements of the heavenly bodies are traced to the force of gravity, or whether a group of facts, of which one is the discovery of a woman's body with the throat cut, is accounted for by A. B.'s having cut it in order to facilitate his stealing her jewels. Mr. Stephen spares no pains in describing and illustrating the mode of reasoning in each class of cases. Among five *causes célèbres* which he has abridged, the trial of Palmer for the murder of Cook is pre-eminently instructive. The actual administration of poison to the deceased was seen, it will be recollect, by nobody, and the result was established exclusively by inference from a number of relevant facts. There is no step of the scientific mode of reasoning through induction and deduction from the known to the unknown which does not receive illustration in some part of the proceedings at that celebrated trial.

Mr. Stephen is careful to point out to his readers that, though the mode of proceeding in scientific and judicial inquiry is identical, the situation of the judge differs materially from that of the man of science as regards facilities for prosecuting the inquiry successfully. The facts of human conduct, relatively to our powers of ascertaining them, are on the whole much more obscure and intricate than the facts of nature. To every assertion made about nature there is generally a whole cloud of witnesses corroborating one another; to many assertions about conduct there is but a single witness, incapable of being contradicted, and occasionally with strong motives for making false statements. But the great point of inferiority in judicial investigation is the almost total lack of the power which the experimentalist possesses of multiplying experiments—or, in other words, the facts from inferences are to be drawn—without limit or at pleasure. When a former Lord de Ros was accused of cheating at cards, a well-known baronet of the day, who was summoned as a witness, performed, in the sight of judge and jury, the feat of "turning the king," and this was a nearly solitary instance of obtaining that sort of security for a sound judicial conclusion which the man of science has always and absolutely at his command. Still, with all these disadvantages, there is one very great advantage in judicial inquiry. The judge, whether technically called by that name or serving as a member of a jury, has in his own breast a store of experience which enables him in a great degree to correct and complete the reasoning essential to a valid conclusion. General rules about human conduct are only true in the rough, but then these approximate rules are chiefly collected from each man's own experience of what passes in his own mind, confirmed by his observation of other persons' conduct, which he can only interpret by assuming that there is substantial identity between their mental processes and his own. This circumstance, says Mr. Stephen,

invests the rules relating to human conduct with a very peculiar character. They are usually expressed with little precision, and stand in need of many exceptions and qualifications, but they are of greater practical use than rough generalizations of the same kind about physical nature, because the personal experience of those by whom they are used readily supplies the qualifications and exceptions which they require. Compare two such rules as these:—"heavy bodies fall to the ground," "the recent possessor of stolen goods is the thief." The rise of a balloon into the air would constitute an unexplained exception to the first of these rules, which might throw doubt upon its truth, but no one would be led to doubt the second by the fact that a shopkeeper doing a large trade had in his till stolen coins shortly after they had been stolen without having stolen them. Every one would see at once that such a case formed one of the many unstated exceptions to the rule. The reason is, that we know external nature only by observation of a neutral, unsympathetic kind, whereas every man knows more of human nature than any general rule on the subject can ever tell him.

From the many sagacious observations which Mr. Stephen's introduction contains we select those which follow on the common opinion that the inference from the assertion of a witness to the truth of the matter asserted is "an easy matter, calling for no remark":—

To infer from an assertion the truth of the matter asserted is in one sense the easiest thing in the world. The intellectual process consists of only one step, and that is a step which gives no trouble, and is taken in most cases unconsciously. But to draw the inference in those cases only in which it is true is a matter of the utmost difficulty. If we were able to affirm the proposition, "All men upon all occasions speak the truth," the remaining propositions—"This man says so and so," "Therefore it is true," would present no difficulty. The major premiss, however, is subject to wide exceptions, which are not forced upon the judge's attention. Moreover, if they were, the judge has often no means of ascertaining whether or not, and to what extent, they apply to any particular case. How is it possible to tell how far the powers of observation and memory of a man seen once for a few minutes enable him, and how far the innumerable motives by any one or more of which he may be actuated dispose him, to tell the truth upon the matter on which he testifies? Cross-examination supplies a test to a certain extent, but those who have seen most of its application will be disposed to trust it least as a proof that a man not shaken by it ought to be believed. A cool, steady liar who

happens not to be open to contradiction will baffle the most skilful cross-examiner in the absence of accidents, which are not so common in practice as persons who take their notions on the subject from anecdotes or fiction would suppose. No rules of evidence which the legislator can enact can perceptibly affect this difficulty. Judges must deal with it as well as they can by the use of their natural faculties and acquired experience, and the miscarriages of justice in which they will be involved by reason of it must be set down to the imperfection of our means of arriving at truth. The natural and acquired shrewdness and experience by which an observant man forms an opinion as to whether a witness is or is not lying, is by far the most important of all a judge's qualifications, infinitely more important than any acquaintances with law or with rules of evidence.

The interesting question which is raised by Sir H. Maine's paper, whether the English rules of evidence can ever be completely understood, save as exceptions to broad rules excluding testimony, we reserve for discussion on a future occasion.

WORKS OF ROBERT CROWLEY.*

ROBERT CROWLEY belongs to a class of writers of whose works the Early English Text Society has already published a good many, and which we always accept thankfully on the strength of their value in themselves, while we at the same time slightly demur to their right to be put forth as specimens of Early English. Surely no straining of words can bring writings of the age of Edward the Sixth and Elizabeth under that head. A Scottish piece of that time may come in well enough, for the good speech of Bernicia might almost pass as Early English in our own times. But in these works of Crowley, whatever philological value they have is quite secondary to their value as throwing light on the times in which they were written. Robert Crowley is one of the prophets who denounce the evils of their own times. Such prophets always let us behind the scenes as to many things which went on in their times; but their pictures must always have something taken off from them. No age is quite so black as it is painted by those whose express business is to set forth its blackness. Yet the general consent of all contemporary writers as to the wretched state of England immediately after the changes in the middle of the sixteenth century is a fact which cannot be got over. Crowley bears no small part in that sad chorus, and he has found an interpreter of a kindred spirit in Mr. Cowper. He has edited other pieces of the sixteenth century which tell the same tale as Crowley's. And he has further taken up Crowley's parable on his own account. Mr. Cowper seems anxious to make us understand, not only that things were in a very bad way in the sixteenth century, but also that they have not greatly bettered themselves in the nineteenth.

Robert Crowley belonged to the younger generation of Reformers. The great events of the reign of Henry the Eighth were the events of his youth. The exact date of his birth is not known, but it seems to have been about 1518. He went to Oxford in 1534, and became Demy and Fellow of Magdalene, being chosen to the latter post in 1542. In 1549, the third year of Edward, he took to printing in London, largely printing his own works. In 1551 he was ordained by Ridley, and became a popular preacher. During Mary's reign he found shelter at Frankfort. After the accession of Elizabeth he held several livings and prebends in succession, chiefly in London and at Hereford, where for some while he held the dignity of archdeacon. But we find him sometimes resigning, sometimes deprived of, this or that preferment, and presently appointed to something else, in a way which is somewhat puzzling. We suspect that the key is to be found in the change of Primate. Crowley was a strong Puritan, and by no means to the taste of Archbishop Parker, and when he was vicar of St. Giles Cripplegate, he brought on himself the vengeance both of the Primate and of the Lord Mayor by raising disturbance about a funeral in his church which was attended by clerks in surplices. And, as he further put forth opinions which the Archbishop looked on as anabaptistical, it is not wonderful if Parker, in his own phrase, "dulled his glory" by suspending, imprisoning, and finally depriving him. But opinions and doings which were sins in the eyes of Parker might almost pass for virtues in the eyes of Grindal; so it is not wonderful that at the very beginning of the new primacy Crowley got fresh preferment and was much employed as a preacher. But with Crowley's sayings and doings on strictly ecclesiastical matters we are not here greatly concerned, for the pieces which Mr. Cowper has here reprinted are none of them of a purely controversial kind, but are rather political and moral. We have here five pieces, three in verse and two in prose, all of them written and printed by Crowley during the three years when he followed his craft in London in the days of King Edward. In all of them the vices of the age, as Crowley understood them, are lashed without mercy. Crowley is a good citizen and a loyal subject, and preaches unlimited obedience to the law and to the King, but he denounces the evil doings of great men as well as small, and it is plain that his sympathies lie wholly with the lower classes of the people. No class is wholly let off; but the great sinners are the rich men of various kinds, the rent-raisers, the lease-mongers, the enclosers of commons, the simoniacal and pluralist clergy, the merchants who set up for gentlemen, the lawyers who defended causes which they knew to be unjust. In this last matter Crowley touches a very delicate

* The Select Works of Robert Crowley, Printer, Archdeacon of Hereford, &c. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by J. M. Cowper. London: published for the Early English Text Society by Trübner & Co. 1872.

point, which has been disputed about over and over again; but Crowley at least draws a distinction between doubtful cases, where there is something to be said on both sides, and cases where the client's cause is clearly bad. The lawyer's calling, according to Crowley, is in itself "good and godly," if only those who practise it "would walk therein aright." Laws were made to relieve the oppressed, and so forth; but, like other things, they have been corrupted by greediness. Here is Crowley's picture of the unrighteous "man of law":—

Doest thou then walke in thy callyng,
When, for to vexe the innocent,
Thou wilst stand at a barre ballyng
Wylth al the craft thou canst inuenire?
I saye ballyng, for better name
To have it can not be worthy;
When lyke a beast, withoute al shame,
Thou wilst do wrong to get money.

Crowley, as we have said, was a strong Protestant and a strong Puritan, and had no sympathy at all for any relics of Popery which might have escaped the godly zeal of King Edward's Reformation. For abbeys, as abbeys, he could therefore have had no possible love, yet he mourns over their fall after his own fashion. There is nothing about which he is fonder of declaiming than about the alienation of the monastic lands, and especially of the tithes, to private uses, under which head he seems to reckon both their impropriation by laymen and their employment for the private ends of the beneficed clergy. So good a Protestant as Crowley would of course not altogether forbid the marriage of the clergy. Yet he seems to look on priests' wives as a dangerous class, who can claim at most bare toleration. He declaims against the practice of the clergy of all ranks—bishops, archdeacons, canons, and vicars—in "purchasing lands for their heirs," and marrying wives of whom he gives the following picture:—

Fingered ladies, whose womanlike behaviour and motherlike housewifry ought to be a lighte to al women that dwell abouthe you, but is so fare otherwise, that, unless ye leave them landes to marye them wythall, no man wyl set a pime by them when you be gone.

He then goes on:—

I wouldest not your wives shoulde be taken from you, but I wold you shoulde kepe them to the furtheraunce of Goddes truthe, whereof ye professe to be teacheares. Let your wives therefore put of their fine frockes and Franche hoodes, and furnish themselves with al pointes of honest housewifry, and so let them be an helpe to yours studie and not a lette. S. Paul teacheth you not to make them ladies or gentlewomen.

This is worth comparing with Lord Macaulay's famous description of the wives of the clergy in the next century; but it points to a rather different state of things. Unless indeed it be that, while Macaulay is speaking of the lower ranks of the clergy only, Crowley jumbles them all together, from the highest to the lowest, in one sweeping accusation.

Of the three pieces in verse, the first is a set of "one and thirty epigrammes wherein are bryefly touched so many abuses as maye and ought to be put away." The number however is greater than is promised on the title-page, as the epigrams really number thirty-three. The epigrams are put alphabetically, according to their subjects; so he starts with abbeys, and goes on to ale-houses. He muses over the abbeys, and laments that their lands and jewels had not gone to relieve the poor, and to maintain godly preachers. Among the ale-houses he notes a difference between London and other places, for in London they are at least shut during the time of divine service, while

Lyghtly in the contrey
they be placed so,
That they stande in mens waye
when they shoulde to church go.
And then such as loue not
to hear their fautes tolde,
By the minister that readeth
the newe Testament and olde,
do turne into the ale-house
and let the church go;
Yea and men accompted wyse
and honeste do so.

Then there is one epigram which touches the suppression of hospitals in the time of Henry and Edward. A merchant who had been long in foreign parts came home and looked for a "spittle-house" that stood by his own dwelling, and a lordly building stood there instead. He took it for a sign of the growth of wealth in the country, but presently one of the expelled inmates begs alms of him and explains that they were all turned out,

And lyne and dye in corners,
here and there aboute.

Rich men had bought the house and turned away their faces when the old owners craved of them. The merchant had been in Turkey, but never among heathen men had he seen such cruelty as this, and he was sure that God's vengeance would fall upon such wicked men. But, though Crowley is thus strong on behalf of the poor, he was quite aware of the tricks of the professional beggars of his time, of which he gives a ludicrous picture. He winds up however with a precept which would not please a political economist:—

Yet erase not to gyue to all,
wythoute anye regarde;
Though the beggers be wicked,
thou shalte haue thy rewarde.

Then comes an epigram on bear-baiting, which we have somehow known by heart all our days, but had quite forgotten where it was to be found. It is perhaps not quite clear how far Crowley directly

sympathized with the bear, but his notions of the matter were at any rate very different from those of the chronicler of the princely pleasures of Kenilworth; for, in the "terrible tearing" in which the prose writer saw a "sport very pleasant" and "a matter of godly relief," Crowley saw "a full ouglye syght." But his chief thought was that the halfpennies that were given to the bearward ought to have been given to the poor. The wind-up is vigorous:—

If you give it, therefore,
to se a beare fygth,
Be ye sure Goddes curse
wyl upon you lyght.

For a bit of philology, by the way, we distinctly remember that, where we first saw this printed, Crowley's good genitive had got turned into "God his curse."

There are a good many illustrative stories scattered up and down these epigrams, and we certainly cannot think with Warton that they are lacking in "spirit and humour." The next piece is called "The Voice of the Last Trumpet," where Crowley takes upon himself the functions of the seventh angel of the Apocalypse, and calls before him twelve classes of people, each to receive admonitions according to his calling. Part of what he had to say to the lawyers we have already quoted. Here is a piece of advice to merchants in which one of the most cruel incidents of the feudal tenures comes in incidentally:—

Let it suffice the to mary
Phy daughter to one of thy trade:
Why shouldest thou make her a lady,
Or bye for her a noble warden?
And let thy sonnes every chone
Be bounde prentice yeres nine or ten,
To learn some art to lyve upon:
For why shouldest they be gentlemen?

"Every chone" is one of those forms which come in when the real origin of words is forgotten. "Every" is "afer alc," "ever ilk," "ever each"; but the softened *ch* has moved from the end of one word to the beginning of the next. It is something like the very local West-country form "cham" for "I am," that is, is softened, Saxon-fashion, into *itch*, whence the *ch* has moved away to the beginning of the verb.

Then comes the third metrical piece, called "Pleasure and Payne, Heaven and Hell: Rememb're these four, and all shall be well." It is evidently meant to be a Protestant substitute for those musings on the next world of which the mediæval religious poets were so fond. Crowley of course has nothing to say to Purgatory, nor does he indulge in any minute physical descriptions of heaven and hell; but he dramatizes the familiar painted scene of the Last Judgment, and he calls up various classes of offenders, those particular classes of offenders of his own time, of whom we have already spoken, to receive their sentence. The rent-raisers and the lease-mongers and the pluralists and the simoniacal patrons and the swallowers-up of tithes, all come in for their share. Here is a specimen of Crowley in his more solemn style:—

Let the pore man haue and enjoye
The house he had by copyeholde,
For hym, his wyfe and lacke hys boye,
To kepe them from hunger and colde;
And though the lease thereof be solde,
Bye it agayne though it be dere,
For nowe we go on oure laste yere.

Caste downe the hedges and strong mowndes,
That you haue caused to be made
About the waste and tyllage growndes,
Makeyng them wepe that erste were glad:
Leste you your selfes be strykyn sadde,
When you shall se that Christe doeth drye
All tears from the oppresedis eye.

In this last line we get a good genitive in a place where we should least of all have looked for it.

The other two pieces are in prose, and to our mind Robert Crowley writes very stately and dignified prose, perhaps slightly stiff, but not remarkably Latinized, and with very little of what we commonly call quaintness; but then, according to Mr. Earle, it is in the seventeenth century, rather than in the sixteenth, that quaintness is properly at home. No style, for instance, can be more opposite to the style of Robert Crowley than the very perfection of quaintness, the style of Bishop Godwin. The first of the two prose pieces, from which we have already given an extract about the priests' wives, is called "The Way to Wealth, wherein is plainly taught a most present remedy for Sedicion." Here Crowley takes up his parable against the same classes of people against whom he speaks in his poems. He denounces the oppressors; at the same time he preaches passive obedience to the oppressed; they are to stay quiet and God will deliver them sooner or later. The poor men themselves however were, as the history of the insurrection in Norfolk and Cornwall shows, of another mind. Crowley dramatically brings in one of them pleading his own cause, and saying, "no remedye therfore, we must nedes fight it out, or else be brought to the lyke slauery that the French men are in." The last piece takes up very much the same line, in the form of a petition to Parliament:—

An informacion and Peticion agaynst the oppressours of the pore Commons of this Realme, compiled and Imprinted for this onely purpose that amongst them that haue to doe in the Parliamente, some godlye mynded men may hercat take occasiōn to speake more in the matter then the Authour was able to write.

Several other writings of Crowley, many of them, it would seem, of a more controversial kind, are spoken of by Warton, and it

must not be forgotten that he was the first to print the Vision of Piers Plowman, for which we need be not the less thankful to him because it was rather with a polemical than a philological or historical purpose that he printed it.

BAGEHOT'S PHYSICS AND POLITICS.*

WE need not inform our readers that Mr. Bagehot writes in a graceful style, and has much to say upon political topics that is well worth their attention. The little book before us, the chief part of which, if we are not mistaken, has already appeared in the *Fortnightly Review*, will be read with interest, though perhaps it is scarcely equal to his comment on the British Constitution. It may be described as an attempt to apply scientific reasoning to political theory, and is included in the catalogue of the "International Scientific Series." We must say, however, that it is only by using the term "science" in an extremely loose fashion that it can be brought under that head. Mr. Bagehot himself would be the last person to describe it as a statement of recognized principles; and, indeed, fond as people are of using big words in such a connexion, any phrase which couples science and politics must be considered premature. Mr. Bagehot, however, tries to indicate in what manner various scientific theories, and especially those of Mr. Darwin and Mr. Herbert Spencer, may be applied to political speculations. The question is itself interesting, and, in the hands of a very able writer, its treatment leads to a number of remarks well worthy of observation, if not sufficiently systematic or well-established to be dignified with the name of science. Within our limits it is impossible to dwell upon these scattered sayings, and equally impossible to give anything like a full discussion of Mr. Bagehot's general theory. We will endeavour briefly to show at what point his doctrines appear to us to require modification or further development.

The general theory is summed up in his last chapter. As Mr. Bagehot points out, in confirmation of a valuable remark of Sir Henry Maine, we are apt to regard progress—whatever progress may mean—as a universal law of human nature; whilst yet nothing can be plainer than that a very large majority of mankind is and has been stationary. Hence it would be of the highest possible interest to discover what are the necessary conditions of progress. Looking back upon our savage progenitors, and tracing the various developments of the great races of the world, Mr. Bagehot perceives (we state his doctrine in our own language, and apologize if we involuntarily misinterpret him) that there are two general principles which form nations or races, as they have, on the Darwinian theory, formed species of animals and plants. There is the principle of hereditary resemblance, which makes us like our ancestors, and there is the principle of variability, which works through natural selection to cause gradual modifications of type. Now in the earlier ages of mankind, when every tribe had to fight for its existence, the condition of primary importance was the creation of certain fixed customs. A nation could not co-operate unless bound closely together by the iron hoops of custom; and those nations which had the best customs gradually predominated over their competitors. Unluckily the result of this tendency was that many customs became stereotyped, and the nations in which they prevailed passed into a stationary state. Those which preserved a certain flexibility then had the best chance of further development. The expression of this power was the advent of an "age of discussion." Following out some of the lines of thought suggested by Mr. Mill's *Liberty*, and adding some suggestions of his own, Mr. Bagehot insists on the vast importance of this element in a civilized nation, and concludes (it is not a very original conclusion) that "liberty is the strengthening and developing power—the light and heat of political nature." A doctrine upon which he lays much stress is the vast importance of what he calls in *italics* "animated moderation"—or, in rougher language, the need that nations, like men, should have "plenty of go," and yet "know when to pull up."

In a rough statement, this is the substance of a good deal of Mr. Bagehot's writing; and the first thought that occurs to us is that if we strip it of its scientific dress it comes to little more than a familiar platitude. All improvement implies a union of order and progress. Both are essential at every stage of natural development. Order can only be obtained amongst savages by brute force; and therefore, at very early periods, such an institution as slavery, which soon becomes mischievous in the highest degree, may be really useful. It is a necessary step towards division of labour and the development of a class with leisure for intellectual improvement. As men grow more intelligent, it becomes possible to secure order by appealing more to men's reason and less to their fears. Arbitrary force is mischievous as soon as it is superfluous; and what Mr. Bagehot calls an age of discussion may then be originated. All this is substantially true; but we can hardly call it new, or even admit that the scientific basis on which it is placed does very much to strengthen our confidence in the results. However, it is well to restate old doctrines in terms adapted to the age, and we welcome the new light which Mr. Bagehot has so far thrown upon the subject.

We have, however, a certain objection to his theory, or perhaps we should rather say that we are conscious of a gap which requires to be filled up. It is often objected to Mr. Darwin's theories that

they do not give a law in the full sense of the word, but merely state a condition of progress. A beast of prey, he says, develops claws, because the rudimentary claw which occurs in some individual is useful in the struggle for existence. That explains the process by which claws, when once started, came into general use; but it does not attempt to explain the first appearance of the claw. To say that accident produced claws is merely to say in a roundabout fashion that we do not know how they were produced. In other words, there are laws of whose operation we are left in complete ignorance. This does not, of course, imply that Mr. Darwin's theories are not of the highest value, if well founded; but it illustrates the limits within which they are necessarily confined. Now Mr. Bagehot's theories involve the same difficulty, which frequently makes his doctrines look like a mere verbal explanation.

We take his own account of this difficulty in a particular case. The problem being, "Why do men progress?" the answer is, that they have a certain amount of "variability." This sounds, as he remarks, like the old explanation by occult qualities. It is like saying that opium sends men to sleep because it has a soporific quality. No, replies Mr. Bagehot, the explanation is more than verbal. It states that men make progress when the fixity of custom has been developed up to a certain point, and not developed beyond it. "The point of the solution is not the invention of an imaginary agency, but an assignment of comparative magnitude to two known agencies." Let us, however, look a little closer. To say that progress involves variability is saying nothing more than that, in order to change, men must be capable of changing. There is perhaps a little more in the further statement that men must have fixed customs. This is true; and is perhaps not quite self-evident. The addition that, if they are to improve, the customs must not be too fixed, is, as before, mere tautology; and therefore Mr. Bagehot's statement scarcely seems to come to any more than this, that a certain fixity of custom is desirable. Surely that is a proposition which nobody would ever think of denying, whether he was or was not a Darwinian. A really valuable remark would be made if Mr. Bagehot were capable of giving us any sort of rule as to the degree in which customs should be fixed. But this is obviously beyond his power or that of any man. When he tells us that fixity is more desirable at an early than at a later age, he is really making a statement which may be discussed with interest, and which, whether sound or otherwise, has a certain historical value. We have already explained our view of its meaning. But the bare assertion that variability is a condition of improvement seems to us to be no more than verbal, in spite of Mr. Bagehot's efforts to make something of it.

Although we cannot profess to be much struck by this part of the theory, we fully admit that Mr. Bagehot incidentally makes many valuable remarks on the way in which changes are actually brought about. He is too apt, indeed, to mistake a confession of ignorance for a statement of positive knowledge, but his remarks are often ingenious. Thus, for example, he attributes great importance to the process of what he calls unconscious imitation. He says—and the remark is true and curious—that "every one who has written in more than one newspaper knows how invariably his style catches the tone of each paper while he is writing for it, and changes to the tone of another when he begins to write for that." He explains in this way the origin of different schools of literature, and extends the remark to national character. Steele, for example, to use his illustration, struck out the notion of essay-writing. Addison took it up and perfected the art. The public taste was impressed, and a whole group of inferior writers was infected by the same style; and thus we account for the change between the days of Shakespeare and Bacon and those of Pope and Locke. The New England type of character has, he thinks, been developed after the same way by the attraction exercised by the first Puritan emigrants. Now it is plain that this is no explanation at all of the first cause of the phenomenon. Why did Steele take to writing essays, and why did they strike the public taste? It does not account for the cholera to say that A. caught it from B., and B. from C., and so on to the end of the alphabet. Why, we must ask, did Z. catch it? and, moreover, what were the conditions that made it catching? These are the real problems, and an answer to them would lead to valuable results—such, for example, as the importance of drainage. The answer given by Mr. Bagehot tends to distract attention from the real difficulty. If Steele had died in his infancy, would not the same literary type have been produced by somebody else? Were there not hundreds of men partaking of the same general sources of inspiration, and labouring to find a convenient mode of expressing themselves? A philosophical observer would inquire into the contemporary state of theology and philosophy, the social conditions, the influence of foreign countries, and a hundred other causes of a general character; and, so far as he allowed himself to be put off with Mr. Bagehot's answer, he would be tempted to believe that a profound change in national modes of thought and expression was simply accidental; and perhaps, very unphilosophically, to call accident a cause. Mr. Bagehot's remarks are useful as illustrating the method in which a change, once begun, is propagated; but they are obviously irrelevant in considering the determining causes of the change. We do not imagine that he would dispute this; but he seems scarcely to give sufficient prominence to the profounder movements of thought, because his whole attention is devoted to the external apparatus.

* *Physics and Politics.* By Walter Bagehot. London: King & Co. 1872.

The same theory occurs, in connexion with a more distinct logical error, in another part of his book. Mr. Bagehot attributes great importance to the savage belief in lucky omens, and he explains their occurrence in this way. An expedition, he says, fails when a magpie crosses its path, and a magpie is then supposed to be unlucky. Surely this is an inversion of the real process; and an inversion which again leads him to attribute exaggerated importance to mere chance. The case may be illustrated from his own anecdotes. Somebody told Scott to cure a disease by sleeping for a night on twelve smooth stones collected from twelve brooks. Does Mr. Bagehot suppose that this superstition originated in the accident that somebody had slept on twelve stones collected from twelve brooks, and been cured accordingly? How did anybody come to think of collecting the stones and sleeping upon them? Could such an accident possibly occur? Obviously the superstition originated in a deductive, and not an inductive, process. It was not the result of experiment, but an *a priori* theory derived from some notions as to the magic influence of the number twelve, and of stones in brooks. Perhaps Scott's adviser had read Shakespeare, and fancied, like a good Presbyterian, that objects which included sermons must have a mysterious virtue; or he had a shadowy recollection of the stones set up in Jordan; or some other fanciful association of ideas may have been derived from fifty other causes. But surely nothing can be plainer than that the association preceded the experiment, and indeed was the only reason for making an experiment of so arbitrary a character. The confusion of ideas depends upon the well-known law of the incapacity of an uncultivated mind to distinguish between objective and subjective impressions. Mr. Bagehot when he was a boy used to play loo; and his childish companions found that a particular "fish" which was prettier than the others brought luck with it. Why? Not because a boy who had that fish had won on a particular occasion, but because the pleasure of having a pretty fish was naturally associated with the pleasure of winning the game. The boys thought, like Mr. Bagehot, that a mysterious power called "luck" had a good deal to do in the world, and that when it meant to favour a boy, it would give him a pretty fish as well as a good set of cards. Similarly, for some reason not now traceable, savages disliked magpies; perhaps they are bad to eat, or their cry suggests alarm; and the unpleasant sensation produced by the flight of the bird suggested the unpleasant sensation of being defeated, which again, they fancied, might precede as well as follow the actual occurrence of a defeat. Why indeed should they attend to magpies more than to a hundred other phenomena, except that they already had some associations with it? The same thing is proved, if it needed proof, by the universality of certain superstitions. All rude nations are frightened by eclipses, and therefore all rude nations suppose eclipses to portend disaster. If they had argued on the matter, they would have necessarily found as many eclipses preceding victories as preceding defeats; and therefore their views of the meaning of an eclipse would probably have been equally divided. Mr. Bagehot imagines that some "Nestor of a savage tribe" remarked a coincidence, and that his authority gave popularity to the superstition founded upon it. Therefore he infers that "luck" played a great part in the world. The true process we take to be entirely different. Some obvious associations of ideas are suggested to all savage tribes, and give birth to superstitions which bind the "Nestor" as well as his fellows. And the examination of this process leads to the discovery of a curious mental law, which is left unnoticed if we accept Mr. Bagehot's crude explanation.

In spite of these errors, as they seem to us, which lower our estimate of the value of Mr. Bagehot's book, the line of his inquiries suggests to him many interesting remarks the value of which is not diminished by the questionable nature of some of his theories; and on the whole we can recommend the book as well deserving to be read by thoughtful students of politics.

THE ROMANCE OF HISTORY.*

THE five octavo volumes which bear this title are made as attractive outwardly as red cloth and gold letters can make them, and each volume bears on the back and side the arms of the country from the history of which the tales it contains are supposed to have been taken. These tales have already made their appearance in some other shape, and have, if we may believe the introductory prefaces, been so well received that the present publishers consider "that they will add to the literary pleasure of another generation by reproducing them in a compact form." They are moreover embellished with numerous illustrations somewhat of the old-fashioned sort, which know no mean between the utter imbecility of countenance supposed to be inseparable from loveliness and virtue and the painful deformities and hideous glare ascribed to all unpleasant characters, from harmless maniacs to villains of the deepest dye. Good and bad alike, too, make impossible contortions and writhings of body and limbs without for a moment losing their placid smile. But, although so much trouble has been taken to contribute to the pleasure of the readers of these volumes, their profit has not altogether been lost sight of. Certain pages of closer print, with dates at the beginning of each paragraph, have been put in between the "Tales," under the name of "Historical Summaries." We suspect that these summaries will share the

fate of the hymns and prayers with which certain goody stories are interleaved, and which are generally left unread by the children for whose improvement they are intended. We hope it may be so; for, not content with the usual vulgar errors, the summaries seem to have hit on some new blunders quite peculiar to themselves. But in addition to these "Historical Summaries" we are told that, "where modern historical research has shown that the Fiction varies too palpably from the Fact, notes have been added." Eager to profit by the labours of modern historians, we turn at once to the first of these notes in the volume on England. We there find that our modern historian is none other than Giraldus Cambrensis, and all he has to tell us is the old story of Harold's escape from the field of Senlac and after-life as an "anchooret" in a cell attached to St. John's at Chester. If the editor will take the trouble to turn to the pages of Mr. Freeman's History, he will find this legend given there for what it is worth, and its true meaning and value pointed out. After having learned this, we think he would do well to write yet another note, and this time to add it to the *fact*, not to the *fiction*.

It would be hard to say for whom these tales are intended. Not for children surely. The love-making that forms the chief feature in one and all of them is far too decided to allow of their entrance into any well-regulated nursery or school-room. But for that they might find favour in the eyes of the little folk who delight chiefly in stories about cruel kings and lovely princesses, but we scarcely think their absurdities will be swallowed by the elder brothers and sisters who have attained to the dignity of full-grown novels. Historical, or would-be historical, tales must however be popular with some class of readers, or we should not be so overrun with them. We believe that there are certain persons whose minds are so constituted that they cannot feel an interest in any historical characters unless they are told the colour of their eyes and hair, and who look with contempt upon any manuals that do not satisfy their curiosity on these important points. To all such persons we without hesitation recommend these "Tales." Not a leaf can you turn but some notable personage with whose name you are already familiar is introduced to you with keen blue eyes or large black ones, jetty ringlets, auburn tresses, or locks blanched with age, just as it suits the writer's fancy. But whatever they may be to readers, we do not at all wonder that the historical tale should be a favourite style with writers of fiction. They consider themselves at liberty to play all sorts of queer tricks with the doings and fames of the worthies whom they thus draw out of their sepulchres. They are unfettered by the necessity of giving to their plots that minimum amount of probability exacted in the modern novel, or of making their puppets speak a language in some degree akin to the talk of rational human beings, and in general the tales are short enough to avoid the risk of changing the complexion of the chief actors more than once, at all events, before the end. All that the writer of an historical tale has to do is to choose a certain number of names from the first history that comes to hand, to ascribe to these names a picturesque mixture of stalwart frames, graceful forms, waving ringlets, and flowing beards, to make them call their equals "master" instead of "mister," their superiors "my liege," and their inferiors "minion" or "varlet." Furthermore, he must put into the mouths of these creatures of his fancy certain stock words and phrases, such as "durance" for imprisonment, "malison of heaven" for a pretty strong dose of abuse, and he must scatter such expressions as "by our Lady," "Heaven forefend," "Good sooth," "Peace, minion," "Mark me, my masters," "Marry, my lords," "Ha, hail!" "tush" or "methinks," broadcast over the pages. He must make all things subordinate to the fortunes of some young man and young woman to be styled alternately "fair damsel" or "wench," "springald" or "comely youth," according to the friendly or hostile feelings of the supposed speaker. Let him then wind up with either a wedding or a murder, according to the state of his own temper, and he will have turned out a very tidy tale with very little trouble to himself.

The first of the tales in the English series comes up pretty fairly to these requirements. It is called "Wulfstan of Worcester," and may serve as a specimen of the miserable nonsense which is here palmed off under the guise of history. As was to be looked for, all the characters are either Normans or Saxons; but our hopes of making the personal acquaintance of a real live specimen of that wondrous being the "semi-Saxon" are this time disappointed. The legend of the English Bishop's appeal to the dead Confessor, and of the miracle wrought at his tomb, goes a long way towards filling up, and the inevitable pair of lovers are united in a somewhat irregular and sudden fashion in presence of the Council held in the West Minster. This interesting pair are of course a Norman and a Saxon; but by way of giving zest to the tale, the bride, a lovely creature, who has seen some eighteen summers (what do heroines do with themselves in winter?), is none other than the daughter of the "Reverend Prelate." Against such a scandal we must protest. It is bad enough to make the saintly Wulfstan break forth into profane swearing; but to give him a fair daughter, who gazes from the windows of her father's palace at the "spires and columns of the cathedral," and "the majestic summits of Malvern," is downright defamation of character. In those days a wife and daughters were not looked on as the indispensable tenants of every episcopal palace. We do not mean to assert that bishops with such incumbrances were entirely unknown; but they were few and far between, and only such as had been married before entering the priesthood. Not of these was Wulfstan of Worcester, the Saint who in early youth became first a priest and then a

* *The Romance of History.* London: Warne & Co. New York: Scribner, Welford, & Armstrong.

monk, in that city where as prior, and afterwards as bishop, he led that life of purity and virtue which places him as the best and holiest of the churchmen of his time; the man who by his wisdom won the favour of princes, and by his eloquence induced the money-loving merchants of the great commercial city of the West to renounce the unlawful trade by which they had their gain; the priest who ceased not to raise his voice against the laxity and self-indulgence of his married brethren. For a better understanding of his life and conversation we recommend Mr. Neale to study carefully the authority to whom we have already referred. And we would in all brotherly love counsel the weavers of those tissues of fable commonly called historical tales, if they must sport with the characters of "Reverend Prelates" to pitch upon some one whose life and virtues have not been so minutely chronicled as those of Wulfstan, the saintly Bishop of Worcester.

The Historical Summaries in the French series are longer and fuller than those on England. The writer, Mr. Ritchie, has free scope for airing his own views on religion, politics, and philosophy, and he really becomes entertaining. He brings us into a very wonderland of monsters and hobgoblins, the slayers of whom deserve to share the renown of the giant-killer of nursery legend. His pet bogie is clearly the state of affairs which he is pleased to call feudalism. It haunts him in every page, and against it he wages ceaseless and deadly war from its cradle to its grave. On the second page the birth of this monster is chronicled in a list of other important events, though unfortunately the day of the month and year seem to have been lost. A little further on it takes a human form. Hugh Capet, we are told, was the "personification of feudalism." By and by it turns to stone, for in the eleventh century "the keystone was placed of the great arch of feudalism which bestrode the kingdom from one end to the other." Not such a great stride, after all, in those days, when but a small piece of Gaul went to the making of the kingdom. But before another hundred years have gone by the arch springs to life again, and becomes a hobgoblin, and his stride has stretched still wider, and now takes in the whole Continent. But the end draws near. We read how "Philip Augustus struck a successful blow at feudalism, that terrible hobgoblin which bestrode Europe." This hobgoblin, however, was by his excesses cutting his own throat, and therefore we are not surprised to find meted out to him the punishment which the great poet of the Shades would have us believe is the award of suicides. He is transformed yet once again, into a tree, and before long it is all over with him. By the seventeenth century "the whole pith and sap of the many-branched régime of feudalism had long since gone to strengthen the central trunk of absolutism."

The career of the Church may rival the wondrous course of "feudalism." In very early days we learn that "Priestcraft waxing to a Colossus soon encompassed in its fatal stride all Europe." After such a stretch we are not at all surprised to hear of "the power of the Church advancing with gigantic pace." We only wonder, in all simplicity, how much further the next step would take it, and how it came that it did not at once step across the ocean, and light on the New World on the other side. Prepared however as our minds have been by all these marvels, still when we read that "the Pope re-bellowed another bull," it fairly takes our breath away. With the accomplishment of speaking pearls, diamonds, or frogs, all readers of fairy tales are familiar, but the power of "bellowing a bull" casts these fairy gifts quite into the shade. After all these wonderful statements we are not surprised to find that Mr. Ritchie feels a special aversion to critics, and reckons among the misdeeds of Charles the Ninth that he "patronized authors and critics." He has indeed a happy knack of saying something instructive about all the kings. He tells us that Francis the First was "a very gentlemanly king, which was so far well, as France had by this time become an absolute monarchy." Sometimes, too, a prophetic gleam lights up the gloomy annals of wars and fighting, or we are taken behind the scenes and let into the secrets that set the springs of history in motion. Thus we are told that "William Duke of Normandy conquered England and established a despotism as general as feudalism permitted. William was fat; and the King of France unfortunately joked upon this circumstance. This occasioned a war which may be said to have continued with some truces of God till the battle of Waterloo." We hope that this warning as to the folly and wickedness of making personal remarks will be taken by all young readers.

Having seen what the facts in this volume are, we shall not expect better things from the fictions. It begins with the old story of how Bertha (should it not be Emma?), the daughter of Charles the Great, carried her lover Eginhard across the snow to avoid the risk of tell-tale footsteps. Of course it is but a small thing to speak of her as a "daughter of the House of France," to put French songs into her mouth and to frenchify Aachen into Aix-la-Chapelle; but it is something new to meet the Great Karl coming through a wood singing a song which "seemed to be one of the war hymns of the Celts popularly known in France since their collection a few years before by the King." We should be glad to know whether these hymns were sung by the Celts before they began to speak Latin, or during the time when the popular songs were like the common talk in the tongue of the Roman people. All through this tale, "The Court of Charlemagne," Mr. Ritchie seems to imply that French was the language of the Frankish Court. Yet he knows better, or, at all events, before the end of the volume he has learnt better, for in the summary to the twelfth century we learn:—

The Latin and Tudesque tongues—the latter a dialect of Germany—were

now fully molten into what is called the Roman, or Romance; which, polished by nearly seven centuries, is the French language of our day.

Badly expressed as this is, one can at least see what it means; and the meaning is true so far as it goes, and shows that Mr. Ritchie knows perfectly well what a modern mixture French is. But the tit-bit in this tale is kept for the last, when Constantine, the son of the Eastern, or, as they considered themselves, sole Emperors of Rome, sends to the rival who has cut him out in the favour of Bertha a sword whereon was inscribed

To the most illustrious the Prince Angilbert, from his friend Constantine of Greece.

This inscription, we are told, astonished every one, and we are not at all surprised at that. Would that it had been preserved, that it might astonish us too! It would have been a very fitting companion for that other interesting relic, the "Sword that Baalam wished for."

But the wonders we have found in France have tempted us to overstep our limits, and we have but a few lines to spare for the rest of the series; to wit—Spain, by Don T. de Trueba; India, by the Rev. Hobart Caunter; and Italy, by C. Macfarlane. As for Spain, as it is only in the sixteenth century that it appears as a power in Europe, the general run of readers know even less about the history of the several States that go to form the modern kingdom than they do of other countries, and romancists may give their fancy a very loose rein without fear of being pulled up short for inaccuracy. We must, however, protest against calling Joanna the Queen Dowager, after the accession of her son Charles the First, as her reign continued in name at least until her death.

Italy has come off best in the series. The manner in which the tales are told is much better, and the matter of which they are made up is less improbable than in the other volumes. But we cannot help noticing a blunder, perhaps the most generally accepted of all the many blunders which pass current with unthinking people; to wit, that the last year of one century is the first of the next. Mr. Macfarlane begins his summary of the fifteenth century with the year 1400, and though by so doing he is only following the example of Sismondi, of Villani, and of Boniface the Eighth, too, for that matter, who proclaimed a Jubilee for the end of the century in 1300, it is still distinctly wrong. Would Mr. Macfarlane be content if a debtor who owed him 100*l.* paid him 99*l.*? If not, why should he defraud the fourteenth century of its last year, and put down the doings of that year 1400 to the account of the already almost too eventful fifteenth century?

COLONEL HAMLEY ON THE FRANCO-GERMAN WAR.*

If some one could have told Colonel Hamley, when his now well-known work appeared seven years since, that within this short space of time it would twice become his duty to rewrite large portions of it in order to convey to the readers of new editions fresh teachings as important as any he had gathered from all former history, we doubt if even his prescience would have admitted the possibility. Yet so it actually has proved. Scarcely had the world made acquaintance with the book as originally penned, when the war of 1866 came to upset all past experiences, and to prove that a veteran leader, supported by veteran officers, and fully confident of victory, might be beaten and crushed at every point by inexperienced generals at the head of what had hitherto been regarded as a mere peace army, but which was carefully trained and carried a better weapon. So brief was the collision of 1866, and so sudden the Austrian defeat, that it was difficult to gather its full lessons aright. The Prussians themselves had not completely learnt them, although guided by the almost prophetic spirit of Captain May, when their late trial came upon them. As much however as was to be told Colonel Hamley collected in his second edition, noticed by us on its appearance (*Saturday Review*, July 31, 1869). What 1866 left incomplete 1870 has finished. What was subject for discussion three years since is now matter of historical evidence and deliberate judgment. Vast changes, all admit, have come about. But how far the greater principles of strategy must be modified in accordance with the increased size of armies and the progress of the steam-engine and telegraph; what are the limits to the revolution which rifled field-guns and breech-loading small-arms have palpably forced upon us in tactics—these are questions with which a really standard work, such as that before us, must deal, under penalty of being held antiquated if they are passed over. We are not surprised to find that Colonel Hamley gives two complete chapters to the results of the late war, and to these we propose to confine our attention.

The circle of readers which Colonel Hamley addresses, as he points out in his preface, is widening from year to year as military education improves. Whether it be, as he suggests, that the details of the late great wars have shown the vastly increased importance of professional knowledge, or whatever may be the special cause, the fact is certain. Any one who recalls the ignorance of the public as to the events of 1859, when a true conception of even the broader part of the strategy was altogether exceptional, and contrasts the state of things then with that two years since, when every educated man who had leisure followed the movements from day to day, will realize how great is the change among ourselves. Objects purely professional, as Colonel Hamley remarks, excite among ourselves an interest which extends far beyond the army. Meanwhile, over

* *The Operations of War.* By Colonel E. B. Hamley, R.A., C.B. Third Edition. London: William Blackwood & Sons.

the greatest of our neighbours there has passed a change of a far more serious kind. The turning of the whole Prussian nation into a great school of war Colonel Hamley regards as the most remarkable of many proofs of the unwonted attention paid by this generation to military science. We differ from him here, believing it rather the prime cause of the feverish activity of other countries than a mere part of a blind general movement of the time. Be this as it may, the present age has lived to see "in Prussia a nation devoted to the requirements of the army, and an army devoted to the requirements of war"—spectacle the world has never known before since the era of Roman conquest, except for a brief space under the First Napoleon. The fact is there, whatever be the criticisms on it; and those who live in the age have no business to leave it out of their reckoning. It is a sense of this movement, no doubt, and a consciousness that it adds to the appreciation of his work, which makes Colonel Hamley launch his new edition in full confidence that its lessons will go far beyond the profession directly addressed.

A brief but very pregnant chapter of the new edition is devoted to Changes in Contemporary Tactics. Those who are acquainted with the published Wellington Essays, and remember that Colonel Hamley selected them, will be prepared to find how completely his mind, despite a natural conservatism, has accepted the teachings of the late campaign as to the rejection of old formations for the attack. Theory and traditions, as he clearly points out, gave way in 1870 under the pressure of facts. The attack at once came to consist of, instead of being merely covered by, skirmishers. And the Prussians being, by their superior training, far better prepared for the new conditions than the French, the advantage fell naturally to their side. But Colonel Hamley is not content with merely going over the ground to see what has been done. He seeks to pierce the future of war, and, after fully elaborating his account of the present Prussian system, he points out how largely it is influenced by their unbroken success, and intimates that their confiding in cavalry because cavalry have done so much for them, and in offensive tactics because these in France have so constantly brought victory, are circumstances which may possibly be turned against them hereafter. It is not to be expected, he declares, that any army will ever be better fitted for fighting than theirs is now. Success, therefore, must be sought mainly in anticipating and preparing to meet the peculiarities of its warfare in its latest developments. His ideal defence of a country against the Germans is so important that it should be given in his own words unabridged:—

An antagonist may calculate on finding all their movements at first characterized by audacity, and should seek therein his advantage. He should meet their reconnoitring cavalry with a well-maintained cordon of mounted riflemen. Knowing that their advanced guards will be eager to engage, he should draw them into attacks on his own, bringing up a force of mounted riflemen to turn the scale against the infantry, and of cavalry to attack the great battery which will be presently seeking to overwhelm him. Except with manifest advantages on his side, he should not at first imitate their tactics by seeking to engage, but await them in position, combining his defence with the offensive action of a detached force [the italics are our own] which would manoeuvre for the occasion on a pivot of its own, but which would receive its impulses from the general-in-chief by means of the telegraph. Should the enemy seek to turn his position by a circuit, he may throw himself across the heads of their columns, confident of finding that their eagerness to engage will have caused them to extend unduly, and that he will be met at the successive stages of his attack by numbers constantly inferior to his own. If the intercepting movement be completed before he can meet it, he may strike boldly at their rear with the certainty of finding there a vulnerable point. When about to become the assailant, he should manoeuvre to base himself anew and threaten their communications; for though this may have been foreseen by them, yet the sudden change must derange their plans and complicate their movements. Other operations in a similar spirit will suggest themselves to the reader; and, throughout the campaign, advantage should be taken of the railways, telegraphs, and temporary bases available for an army in its own country, to combine simultaneous operations, on varying fronts, for a common purpose of defence or attack. And though it is not to be doubted that tacticians as sagacious as those of Prussia must have foreseen how their own tactics may be met, yet it is by no means certain that the alternative system they may devise will be so successful as that which destroyed the armies of France.

The idea we have italicised of combining the defence of a position with a moveable force outside, is plainly a favourite one with Colonel Hamley, and he applies it admirably elsewhere to a concrete example, by supposing that Bazaine on August 18 had thus detached part of the reserves—of which he actually made no use—in the direction of Thionville, so as to retain the power of bringing them to bear suddenly on the rear of the Guards and Saxons in their attack on his right flank. Bazaine, we know, was occupied entirely with his other flank, and indeed was in every way singularly unequal to the occasion. But the comment made on this and similar tactical opportunities is very just, that "there have been as yet few or no examples of the facilities for new combinations which science has conferred on war."

Colonel Hamley goes much further than this reflection. He declares of the battles of 1870 that the student will learn nothing from them of the higher tactics which make skill supply the place of greater force, or effect great results with small loss. We believe that in the main he is right, and he is certainly so when he asserts that such tactics are quite as desirable now as under former conditions. It will be seen that at this point he breaks off entirely from such writers, for instance, as Boguslawski, who treat what happened at Woerth, Gravelotte, and Sedan as the inevitable form of future war, and almost demand a superiority of numbers in order to ensure victory. To us it has always seemed that their assumptions are somewhat hasty. It must be against all human experience that geniuses should suffer in power by having better materials to work with than before. And we strongly recom-

mend, therefore, to those who have believed the subject to be exhausted and the question decided, a careful study of Colonel Hamley's chapter on Contemporary Tactics.

Hardly less deserving of attention is that on the Campaign of Metz and Sedan which will be found in another portion of the new edition. Dry this is of necessity in form, being rather a key than an independent narrative; but special interest attaches to the writer's comments at the end, and above all to his treatment of the supposed case of Bazaine's escape. Had this been attempted at once, when the French found themselves headed off at Mars-la-Tour, by a sudden movement through Metz, and a march beyond it south-eastward, Colonel Hamley shows with masterly clearness that there was nothing to prevent its immediate success. The French would soon have got into an untouched district. They would have destroyed with ease the German communications; and, by marching on Strasburg and raising the siege, they would have imparted a victorious aspect to the movement. German writers will not admit that their generals would have been, as Colonel Hamley believes, "much more solicitous to restore their communications than to follow Bazaine"; but no one can doubt that if the movement had succeeded even partially, the whole aspect of the first part of the war would have been changed. As a general reflection on the strategy of the campaign, Colonel Hamley has undisputed truth on his side when he points out that the predominance of the German armies, manifest from the outset, deprives it of much of its value as a study. This chapter is closed by what most readers will give the author their particular thanks for. This is a brief but thorough examination of the new frontier line of France, which, as is shown, is still capable of being made strong against new German invasion, but only at a large fresh outlay for defensive works. The resources of France seem almost unlimited, but, adding this need to her other present military requirements, it is quite clear that she has a very long time to look forward before she can hope to meet her late conquerors on anything like terms of equality.

DAVIES'S HESIOD AND THEOGNIS.*

THIS excellent little work belongs to the series of *Ancient Classics for English Readers*, edited by the Rev. W. Lucas Collins. If all the other works of this series are written with the same ability as *Hesiod and Theognis*, a very valuable addition, in an unpretending form, will have been made to the literature of the country. Perhaps, however, it is too much to expect that the editor can be in every case fortunate enough to secure the services of a writer who, like Mr. Davies, unites to a scholarly knowledge of Greek or a less scholarly knowledge of English. It has of late been made only too clear that men may be distinguished as teachers of the classics, and set among the highest in the ranks of schoolmasters, and yet may be unable to write their own language with any degree of accuracy. From some other books of this same series which have already been brought before our notice, we feel very hopeful, however, that in the present case the work throughout will be well done. It is difficult to estimate too highly the value of such a series as this in giving "English readers" an insight, exact as far as it goes, into those olden times which are so remote and yet to many of us so close. It is in nowise to be looked upon as a rival to the translations which have at no time been brought forth in greater abundance or in greater excellence than in our own day. On the contrary, we should hope that these little volumes would be in many cases but a kind of stepping-stone to the larger works, and would lead many who otherwise would have remained in ignorance of them to turn to the versions of Conington, Worsley, Derby, or Lytton. In any case a reader would come with far greater knowledge, and therefore with far greater enjoyment, to the complete translation who had first had the ground broken for him by one of these volumes. It is true that a man with the skill of the late Mr. Conington, instead of merely translating a line, may often so paraphrase it as at once to give his readers the same idea as is conveyed in the original, when a literal translation, unless it were backed up by a long antiquarian note, would have been altogether beyond their understanding. Nevertheless, if this is too frequently done, we have as the result such a work as Pope's *Imitations of Horace's Epistles*, which, admirable as it is in itself, and doubly interesting as it is to a man who knows Horace, yet to the ordinary reader is anything but Horace. But when once an English reader has first read with the care it deserves such a work as the one before us, he can then come to a translation of Hesiod or Theognis which shall be close, and yet shall be within his understanding. He will have found difficulties cleared away, what was unknown and strange made well known and familiar, and a languid curiosity oftentimes quickened into an eager desire. No one, we will undertake to say, can read Mr. Davies's brief account of Theognis, and the selections he gives from Hookham Frere's translation, without at once resolving to read the whole translation as soon as he can get at it. And not a few fair classical scholars who may chance to pick up this little volume will be led to read it for the first time in the original, not only Theognis, but also Hesiod.

It is for "English readers," however, that these volumes are chiefly intended, and it is on them that they will confer the greatest benefits. It is not merely that they will open up to them a world which was almost closed, but that they will render them far more able than before to enjoy our own Eng-

* *Hesiod, and Theognis*. By the Rev. James Davies, M.A., late Scholar of Lincoln College, Oxford, translator of "Babrius." Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1873.

lish literature. We do not know that we should go so very far beyond the mark if we were to say that a man who is ignorant of the chief Latin writers loses quite as much when he reads English authors as when he does not read Latin authors. How much does a man lose, often indeed without knowing it, who, unfamiliar with Latin, reads Addison, or Fielding, or even Thackeray! The volumes in the series before us indeed, however well they may be done, will be very far from putting man on the same level as the classical student; but nevertheless they will do a great deal for him. Many an allusion which before was dark to him they will make clear, and many a turn of thought which before would have seemed to him awkward they will at once render graceful. To the young classical student, too, we cannot but think that these volumes will render a great service. If at our great public schools no time could be stolen in the hours of leisure from cricket and foot-ball for a little quiet reading, nevertheless one or two of these volumes might with advantage be set as a pleasant task for each vacation. When we consider that the practice at all schools is not to read an author right through, but to familiarize a boy as far as can be with the style of as many authors as possible, it will be evident that any one whose mind is not utterly sluggish must often be eager to know what had gone before and what came after the part he had been set to study. A class reads perhaps some three or four books of the *Aeneid* or of the *Iliad*, and then *Aeneas* and Achilles, like personages who figure at a levée, have to stalk off and make room for others. In a levée no doubt a constant and rapid succession is pleasing enough; but when Turnus and Hector are still in the full tide of their success, we do not envy that boy who, as he leaves his *Aeneid* or his *Iliad*, can be contented to leave these heroes too, utterly careless whether they win or lose. Moreover, how much better prepared would a lad enter upon the study of the *Georgics* if he had first read Mr. Davies's interesting chapter on the Imitators of Hesiod, and seen the source whence sprang that noble "glorification of labour" of the great Roman poet! Nay, how much better would he understand many minor points in Latin poetry—as, for instance, the great oath of the Gods, the swearing by the Styx—if he had read of the awful penalty which in Hesiod's *Theogony* we find inflicted on any god who, after taking that dread oath, was guilty of falsehood! To read a classical poet without a knowledge of Hesiod's *Theogony* is like reading *Paradise Lost* or the *Pilgrim's Progress* without a knowledge of the Bible. Notes, no doubt, in the one case or the other would supply all the necessary information; but while a student was finding out what was "that forbidden tree," and where was the river Styx, or Silo's brook, or Mount Sinai, he would be in some danger of missing all the poetry.

Mr. Davies has composed his volume on much the same plan as the others of this series which have already appeared. He tells in an interesting manner all that is known of the life of each of the two poets, and, partly in his own words, partly in judiciously chosen passages from the various translations, makes his readers thoroughly at home with the subject of the poem. He has moreover an interesting chapter on Hesiod's Proverbial Philosophy, and another on his Imitators. We think it would have been well if he had thrown more doubt even than he does on the date when Hesiod flourished. He quotes Herodotus's statement that "Hesiod and Homer lived not more than four hundred years before," and further on he says that "tradition, so far as it is of any worth, corroborates the consistent belief of the ancients, that Hesiod flourished at least nine centuries before Christ." We hardly understand how tradition can corroborate a belief which was founded only on tradition; and as for Herodotus's statement on such a matter as this, it is, we conceive, of no worth, while the consistent belief of the ancients is, if possible, of less. Mr. Davies on this point follows Mr. Paley, to whom in his preface he expresses his great acknowledgments. But Mr. Paley of 1861, the year when his edition of Hesiod was published, is not the Mr. Paley of the present day. We should scarcely expect to find, after his Introduction to Homer, that he would rely either on tradition or on Herodotus. If a study of the language of these two early poets and of the customs they describe cannot fix the date when they flourished, nothing else can. Of the tenth century before Christ in Grecian history we know about as much and about as little as of the Court of King Arthur and of his Knights of the Round Table. In the Life of Theognis we find what is apparently a misprint in a date, which will no doubt be corrected in a later edition. It is stated that his life "is supposed to have lasted till beyond 480 B.C., as he distinctly in two places refers to the instant terror of a Median invasion." A man who died in 490 might have suffered from the terrors of a Median invasion, but he would have taken heart again at the great victory of Marathon. Later on, too, Mr. Davies says that "it has been surmised from his speaking of age and death as remote, and of convivial pleasures as the best antidote to the fear of these, that he was not of very advanced age at the battle of Marathon." Those who thus surmised must either have held antediluvian notions of what constitutes "very advanced age," or could scarcely have agreed with Mr. Davies in placing the poet's birth about 570 B.C. On these two points alone do we differ from Mr. Davies, unless perchance in the derivation, which he somewhat upholds, of parts of Hesiod's *Theogony* from the Mosaic Cosmogony. Though "the Hesperian maids"—

Whose charge o'ersees the fruits of bloomy gold
Beyond the sounding ocean, the fair trees
Of golden fruitage—

are "ranked with Death, and Sleep, and Gloom, and its kindred, as the unbegotten brood of Night," we should not therefore be inclined to find the clue "in Hesiod's having a glimmering of the Fall and its consequences." Still less should we be inclined to find in one of the functions of Iris "a vague embodiment of the covenant sealed by 'the bow set in the cloud.'"

Perhaps one of the most interesting and original chapters in the book is that on Hesiod's Imitators, in which Mr. Davies more than anywhere else shows the width of his reading. We should be curious to know, however, if Mr. Davies ever thought of finding in the Icelandic literature a parallel not only to Hesiod in his proverbial philosophy, but also to Theognis in his repartees in verse. There is much in Mr. Morris's admirable translation of *Grettir*—perhaps the finest translation which this age of translations has seen—of which we are reminded by both one poet and the other. The proverbial wisdom of *Grettir* is scarcely, if at all, inferior to that of Hesiod; while, if the Greek poet delights in "the use of a characteristic epithet standing by itself for the substantive which it would commonly qualify (e.g. 'the boneless' to represent 'the caterpillar,' and 'the silvery' for 'the sea')," no less does the Icelandic hero. Who, again, who knows both works, when he reads the following retort of Theognis, will not be reminded of the way in which *Grettir* sang when he too was mocked?—

"But the love of music and song, which led him into the scrape, sufficed also to furnish him with a ready and extemporized retort to the girl's insinuation that perhaps his mother was a flute-player (and, by implication, a slave)—a retort which he, no doubt, astonished his audience by singing to his own accompaniment:—

I am of Æthon's lineage. Thebes has given
Shelter to one from home and country driven.
A true to jests: my parents mock thou not,
For thine, not mine, girl, is the slavish lot.
Full many an ill the exile has to brave:
This good I clasp, that none can call me slave,
Or bought with price. A franchise I retain,
Albeit in dreamland, and oblivion's plain.

A better understanding can surely be got of the circumstances under which the early Greek poets wrote, and perhaps even of the date when they flourished, by the comparative study of the early writings of each Aryan race, than by a reliance on traditions or historians, or a reference to the writings of a Semitic race.

The English reader, we should imagine, while he will be greatly struck to find so much that is utterly unlike the world he himself knows, will be perhaps still more struck by finding so much more that is like. Mr. Davies often, by a happy turn or a happy reference, contrives to bring this home with great force. He shows how the "crinolines and dress-improvers," "the hatbands and scarves," the Carlton and the Reform, and the exiles "hobbing and nobbing over treason in some 'Leicester Square' tavern," all had their counterpart in ancient times. Curious it must be also for the modern reader to find that Sicily, which has for ages been sunk so low, "that isle of the West, was to Theognis's countrymen what America is to ours, the refuge of unemployed enterprise and unappreciated talent." Hesperia is ever flying westward. First it was Greece, then Italy and Sicily, next Spain, then America, and now it is America's western shore. Will it there, like Delos, become for ever fixed, or will it still sweep onwards towards the West, and at last return to that East whence first it started? Somewhat comforting, too, it will be to those who mourn over the good old times to find for how many ages the same mourning has gone on. Hesiod, like ourselves, bad though the times were in which he lived, yet saw worse coming; for, in Mr. Davies's words,

this iron age, at the transition point of which Hesiod's own lot is cast, shades off into a lower and worse generation, the lowest depth will at length be reached, and baseness, corruption, crooked ways and words, will supplant all nobler impulses,

Till those fair forms, in snowy raiment bright,
From the broad earth have winged their heavenward flight,
Called to th' eternal synod of the skies,
The virgins, Modesty and Justice, rise,
And leave forsaken man to mourn below
The weight of evil and the curseless woe.

"English readers," especially young "English readers," will perhaps be less inclined to put all their trust in Mr. Carlyle or in Mr. Ruskin when they find how many hundreds of years it is since the world was thought to be getting to its very worst, and how at that very same time it was rising, with Mr. Gladstone's strides and bounds, to a degree of greatness which it had never before attained. Had we space at our command we might go on further to show how admirably adapted this series is for the general reader, and how well Mr. Davies has done his part of the work. If we break off here in our praises, it is most certainly not, to quote one of Hesiod's proverbs, because we are like those who spare the liquor when the cask is empty.

ERMA'S ENGAGEMENT.*

HAD *Erma's Engagement* been stronger, it would have been a noticeable book in its way. As it is, the combination of "purpose" with lollipop, of advanced strong-mindedness with flowery sentimentality, is not conducive to its sterling value; and we find ourselves involuntarily wishing that the author—or, shall

* *Erma's Engagement*. A Novel. By the Author of "Blanche Seymour." 3 vols. London: Tinsley Brothers.

we say, authoress?—had kept more distinctly to one or other of the two lines, and had been either less full of political doctrine or more sparing of dollish prettiness. "Woman's Rights," when preached by such an apostle as Ermengarde St. Barbe, and practised by such a professor as Mrs. Harley, could not fail to make converts by the very force of individual influence. If two such women had illustrated Mormonism or Thuggism, they would have made the one respectable and the other righteous in the eyes of many, because of their supreme personal attractiveness. But we must not forget that the advocates of a theory have it all their own way in a novel, just as a clergyman has it all his own way in the pulpit. In the interests of justice the portrait of the man painted by the lion ought to be accepted at times; and even the devil's advocate has his uses.

Erma's Engagement is a fair example of this kind of special pleading. Its backbone is the woman's question, and the author has not, as painters say, starved her palette. There are two advocates of woman's rights in the story, Mrs. Harley, and her friend and disciple Ermengarde, or Erma, St. Barbe. The former is a mere shadow, a kind of impersonal principle moving through the pages under the name and style of an everyday woman, but without tangible individuality. She is a wife and mother, passionately opposed to the theory of womanly sacrifice and wifely submission, while in practical reality she lives only to please her husband and to love and educate her children. The latter is a young girl, bright, brave, conscientious, loving, who has learnt to think for herself, hence to doubt and to choose, but whose conduct is regulated by the strictest principles of obedience to her parents, self-surrender to conventional duty, and later, when she marries, of wifely self-suppression to the most extreme point to which amiability can lead a woman. Here, then, lies the radical weakness of the book. The author has not had the true courage of her opinions. No one would find fault with theories that led to such results as these; but they are not the logical results of the theory advocated. Had Erma been faithful to herself, she would have held by her new principles rather than her old teaching, when the two clashed. She would have married Cecil Erristoun, in spite of them all; or, having married Frank, she would have suffered from the mistake of her conformity to an unrighteous code. As things are, she is in the position of one who makes the best of both worlds, and serves God and Mammon with equal success. She gives up the man she loves, and marries the man she does not love, out of obedience to her parents, and because of that very law of womanly self-sacrifice to the wishes and well-being of a man which she so warmly condemns. But she is happy and virtuous with her unintellectual, good-tempered young Nimrod; and she keeps her money by her marriage, which else she would have lost. Then she marries Cecil after all, when poor Frank has conveniently coughed himself out of the way; whereby every one is content, and the wrong is righted before it is too late. All this is absolutely untrue to the dominant principles of the book. It is as if the author had undertaken to curse the law of womanly submission, but had blessed it unawares instead; unless, indeed, she means to show that out of evil comes good, and that a woman with the right kind of political principles can make even an ungenial marriage a success, and sacrifice more dignified than self-assertion. In which case is she not playing into the hands of the enemy—keeping the key of the citadel while showing the way through the breach?

To our thinking, however, Erma did wrong in marrying Frank. She had allowed herself to drift into a settled engagement with him, in express opposition to the terms of her aunt's will, and against her own better judgment and feelings. Having made this mistake, which neither her father nor her mother, nor yet her grave and sensible half-brother, had honestly enough to rectify, she falls in love with her ideal, Cecil Erristoun; he also with her. Her cousin Frank is handsome and good-natured, an athlete and no scholar, muscle not brain, a gentleman but a simpleton. She herself is enthusiastic for knowledge, a reasoner on her own account, bitten with all the new doctrines, and a natural sceptic. The marriage of two such people is the old union of the fire and the clod; and one that no woman who respected herself, even if she were not of the woman's rights' school, would make. And certainly, if there was another and a true love in the background, it was a union which carried with it a certain taint not pleasant to contemplate. But Erma, who at one time declaims violently against the idea of marrying a man because he was going to the bad through disappointment, when her trial really comes, consents to throw over Cecil—after she has engaged herself to him during an interregnum when Frank in a pet has given her up—and to take on herself again a yoke which had galled her unspeakably before. It was not worth while being Mrs. Harley's disciple to come to this conclusion. Any meek-minded Griselda would have done the same, though few would have made so good a job of her misfit as did Erma, who by the very poetry of submission reigns supreme. Nor, we may add, would many young men who had gone so far as Frank on the perilous incline of debt and dissipation have been able to pull themselves up again with such perfect success as he. After his marriage he improves wonderfully. Whether the heart of the author smote her for her cruelty in binding the high-minded Erma with a curly-headed well-bred loon, or whether she relented towards Frank himself, and out of her own pure grace endowed him with the rudiments of a soul and some germs of intellect, we have no means of judging. Sure it is, however, that after he has con-

quered fate and Erma he becomes comparatively aesthetic and sentimental, and is really not so bad a fellow, take him all in all, as many who look his betters. He is very naturally drawn, save that he has more poetic tenderness at times than would belong by right to such a dense-witted athlete; but we should imagine he must have been somewhat in awe of his very superior wife; and it speaks volumes for his good-nature or obtuseness that he kept to his love so long and so loyally.

The family of the St. Barbes are people given to much demonstration, and "making a fuss" seems to have constituted their normal condition. All their heart-breaks, and quarrellings, and love-makings, and reconciliations are transacted in public, and the servants understand the drawing-room barometer as well as the family themselves. Anything serves them for a scene; and the scenes are admirably described. Thus, when Erma in the prospective exercise of her proprietorship of Dunville, announces her intention of giving a piece of land to the Dissenters for their chapel, in opposition to the wishes of her High Church parents and their Anglican pastor, she rouses up a violent storm, which Beatrice, familiarly called Bea, the younger sister, shall tell in her own way, because she tells it with the true domestic point and humour:

"My dear Frank, you never witnessed such a scene," said Beatrice. "Papa stormed, Mr. Wynne looked like the Grand Inquisitor, only language failed him to express his indignation, and mamma scolded poor Erma like anything. Then she told her to go and kiss papa, and say she was sorry, but he was too angry to be mollified, and would not kiss her, upon which she sat down on the sofa, and cried like a Madeleine. Then mamma, who is always in a state if Erma cries, cried too, and said we all combined to break her heart, and that Erma would not have a single eyelash left; and I cried, and Charlie cried, and we all cried."

"Good Heavens!" ejaculated Frank, "what a tapage!"

"Then when he saw mother cry, papa relented and kissed Erma, and we all subsided."

"And Wynne?"

"Oh, I'm sure he said a *De Profundis* to himself while the storm lasted, for, used as he must be by this time to the family excitability, I think he was fairly astonished at the scene that day, and thanked God that he was a bachelor. Afterwards Erma went up to him—don't you know her way? half shy and half proud, and getting very red—and said she was sorry; so he was mollified, and gave her *absolution*."

"And I suppose Uncle Harry was all right afterwards?"

"Oh yes, and Erma went and sat on his knee, and he kissed her, and made ever so much fuss about her, and came into our room when we were going to bed to say 'good night' to her again, and all that." They are always having these breezes, proud and conventional as they are; and a breeze affords Mrs. St. Barbe cause to be "at" Erma for wrinkling her forehead when she talks, and for rubbing her eyelashes out of her eyes when they are swept therein by the tears which come so readily. Here is a case in point, when Erma is refused leave to go to London with Mrs. Harley to hear lectures and learn science:—

"Now, don't be vexed about it, Erma, and cry and spoil your eyes," pleaded Mrs. St. Barbe. "You are so excitable, and work yourself up into a state about everything." The girl dashed away her tears.

"Don't rub your eyes in that way, I implore of you," went on the lady in a despairing tone; "you won't leave yourself an eyelash."

There did not, at present, seem much probability of such a disaster. Miss St. Barbe's long, silky lashes were one of the beauties of her face, but tears had the unpleasant effect of sweeping them into her eyes, which she would then rub vigorously, much to her mother's horror. A slight passage of arms between the pair usually ensued; the young lady would protest that eyelashes were a matter of perfect indifference to her, while her mother would insist on their beauty and utility. On the occasion in question Erma withdrew her handkerchief from her face, and contented herself with blinking her eyelids energetically to restore the lashes to their normal condition. The fact was that she espied her father in the distance, and to be seen in tears by a man was, in her opinion, the lowest depth of degradation; though she had not unfrequently experienced the potency of those feminine arguments in the limited dealings she had hitherto had with the sterner sex. But that was in the days of her youth; now she deemed it unworthy in the last degree to use such weapons, and the readiness of her large eyes to fill with tears on the slightest occasion was one of the greatest trials of this period of her existence.

There is a very good scene too between Erma and her mother, when the latter is trying to induce her to give up Cecil on the score of poverty. "Love is all very fine"—she says; "I married your dear father because I loved him—but you can't dress on it, nor keep a man in good humour on it. How would you like to be sworn at," she goes on to say, "when he comes home tired to an uncomfortable, badly cooked dinner?"—

"He wouldn't swear at me," said Erma, her face flushing at the asperion.

"Of course not! It is well known that men never do. George Travers never was to swear at Mary St. Barbe! Her dear, noble George! Ask her about the matter now! She chose to marry a rising barrister who never rose, and they have to live on a halfpenny a year. You don't know what that is. You have only lived with men who never in their lives had to think how sixpence was to be made to do the work of a shilling. It is a very different thing when a man is perpetually harassed by small means and repeated calls on them. No temper can stand the perpetual strain. You judge from your own point of view. You don't mind an uncomfortable dinner, but a man does; it makes him cross and he scolds his wife, and she finds that it is not all smooth sailing, and is moped and miserable, and loses her good looks and all the attractions that first won him; cries perhaps, and that worries him, and so they go on from one thing to another, soured and miserable."

The conversation ends triumphantly for the mother, who demonstrates the utter folly of Erma's thinking of Cecil Erristoun, notwithstanding his brains, his heroic qualities, his M.P.ship, and his devoted love, by the final arguments, "Who is to do your hair? You can't do it yourself"; and, "You are not fit for a poor man's wife, Erma. Why, you could not sew on a shirt-button for him!"

There is an under plot, or rather a side interest, in the story of

Cecil's wilful sister and his orphan nephew, whom Erma takes up as a little newspaper boy at the corner—a street waif needing care—not knowing who he is. But the episode has nothing to do with the main thread of the plot, save indeed as another example of brutality in husbands, and of the down-trodden condition of wives. Johnnie himself, the nephew in question, is one of the moving shadows of the book; no more. We get no more hold of him than of Mrs. Harley; for though the story has many clever points and graphic touches, it does not always make definite pictures. But indeed we think the whole episode a mistake and an excrescence. Yet, with undoubted defects, *Erma's Engagement* has merit of a kind. There is a tendency in it to stray from the original landmarks which betrays want of grip, and the author has not stood with sufficient steadiness by her flag. All throughout men are represented as normally selfish, brutal, tyrannical to women, self-indulgent, sensual; and we ourselves come in for a feminine fling, characteristic, to say the least of it; but the old leaven is too strong for the new, and the result of the book, after all its frothy talk about woman's rights and woman's wrongs, is woman's self-surrender to the law of love and feminine duty, and the finding of her happiness therein.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

ENGLAND has seldom impressed her peculiar genius more profoundly on the history of the world than by the medium of John Wickliffe.* The hapless Albigenses, easily confounded with Wickliffe through their similar character as reformers, were actually severed from him by a wide interval of feeling no less than of opinion. They were religious revolutionists, whose Pantheistic creed had emanated from Oriental sources. In Wickliffe the world beheld the first endeavour to reconstruct the Church on conservative principles, and his *via media* has ever since been characteristic of average English opinion. Any good book on such a man must always be acceptable; and no apology for this last addition to the list is due from Dr. Lechler. It must perhaps be admitted that the author's qualifications consist rather in his zeal for the subject, and in the earnestness with which he has applied himself to master the materials already extant in print, than in any considerable addition which he has been able to make to ordinary sources of information. We must confess ourselves at least somewhat disappointed at what would seem the comparatively slight value of the forty volumes of unpublished MSS. by and relating to Wickliffe which he has had the opportunity of examining at Vienna and Dresden. If he has really turned them to the best account, it can only be said that their chief importance, as transcripts made by Bohemians, is that of illustrating the congeniality of Wickliffe's doctrines to the highest Slavonic civilization. It might also have been more distinctly expressed in the title how largely the book is devoted to the precursors and successors of Wickliffe in England and elsewhere. With these reservations, we have little but praise for a work of singular research, perspicuity, and sobriety. A laudable endeavour after absolute precision has sometimes rendered the diction more diffuse than was needful; in general, however, the style is pleasant and natural. The first chapters are devoted to an account of Wickliffe's predecessors in the reform of abuses in discipline rather than of corruptions of doctrine, especially Grosseteste, Bradwardine, Richard Archbishop of Armagh, and the author of *Piers Ploughman*. Then succeeds the life of Wickliffe himself, full justice being rendered to the activity in public affairs which his fame as an ecclesiastical reformer has somewhat thrown into the shade. The second volume is occupied by the history of the Lollard and Hussite developments of Wickliffism, and is concluded by an appendix containing specimens of Wickliffe's hitherto unpublished writings. On the whole, if the work contains little that is positively novel, it is probably the most comprehensive survey extant of the early period of the Reformation throughout all its numerous ramifications. The author's point of view is that of an orthodox Lutheran; his impartiality and moderation are exemplary; and he clearly discerns the cardinal fact that the seeds of the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century, no less than of the great intellectual and political revolution of the eighteenth, first germinated on English ground.

Pastor Werner's book on Herder † as a theologian is able and interesting, but too long and exhaustive to be generally consulted except by professional readers. This is to be regretted, as Herder's character as a popular theologian would have warranted a lighter style of treatment, and Herr Werner's ability and impartiality merit a wide circle of readers. He is in love, but not too much in love, with his subject. He admits that the positive results of Herder's biblical criticism have been insignificant, but justly claims for him the distinction of having exemplified a new spirit, and introduced a new era of inquiry, terming him, by a happy phrase, the Winckelmann of the Old Testament. The great source of Herder's influence, however, is to be found in his views of humanity, and their practical application to ecclesiastical doctrine and discipline—a part of the subject discussed in the most sympathetic and appreciative spirit by Herr Werner.

* *Johann von Wicif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation.* Von Gotthard Lechler. 2 Bde. Leipzig: Fleischer. London: Williams & Norgate.

† *Herder als Theolog. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie.* Von August Werner. Berlin: Henschel. London: Nutt.

Professor Bernhard Weiss's work on the Gospel of Mark* is one of the most important recent contributions to New Testament criticism. The writer endeavours to establish the authenticity of Mark's Gospel, with the exception of the last eleven verses, its priority to Matthew and Luke, and the substantial accuracy of the ecclesiastical tradition which represents it as composed in accordance with the oral testimony of Peter. It is, in fact, the first Gospel in the sense of a regular narrative; the earlier work of Matthew, in its original form, having been a mere report of sayings or discourses. These views are supported by a most patient, laborious, and analytical comparison of Mark with the parallel passages in the other Synoptic Gospels.

The attention which we have elsewhere bestowed upon the proceedings of the Vatican Council † renders it unnecessary to here refer to Herr Frommann's history of it otherwise than as to a standard contribution to the subject, the production of one well acquainted with the intrigues of the Roman Curia, and whose point of view is less that of a theologian than of a canonist. The proceedings of another and much more satisfactory Council are published in the ample Report of the discussions of the Congress convened at Eisenach ‡ in October last, for the consideration of social and industrial questions. The moving spirits of the Assembly, among whom occur the well-known names of Dr. Gneist and Dr. Brentano, appear to belong to that modern school of German political economists which endeavour to steer a middle path between Socialism and the absolute *laissez-faire* of the Manchester school. It is in general favourable to combinations among the working classes, rather, however, for mutual insurance and protection against oppressive employers than for the purposes of co-operative industry, respecting the feasibility of which some scepticism appears to exist. Three principal subjects were proposed for discussion—industrial legislation, trade-unions, and the provision of dwellings for the working classes. A report was read upon each, and followed by a long and animated debate. The general view of the speakers appears to be that German industry is successfully striving to adapt itself to a new condition of things, and the point which creates principal anxiety is the deficiency of house accommodation for the working classes, whose condition in this respect is indeed most serious.

Dr. Lazarus's discourse on the part played by ideas in shaping the destiny of nations §, although obscured by metaphysical subtleties, is in the main a worthy tribute to the influence of the solitary thought of individuals and the corporate enthusiasm of masses in determining the course of human affairs. If we are to conclude that it was pronounced precisely as it is printed, and apprehended perfectly as it was delivered, we can but congratulate Dr. Lazarus on having addressed an audience distinguished by sedulousness of attention and quickness of apprehension above all others in the universe.

The result attained by Herr Hensler's essay on the Municipal Constitutions of the Cities of the German Empire || is that they are a development of the old Frankish constitution; and he controverts the theory which makes them dependent on the first public documents in which they are distinctly recognized, the charters of Otho the Great and his immediate successors.

The general tendency of the essay on the Constitution of the modern German Empire, by Joseph von Held, a Bavarian publicist ¶, is to insist that it can only be regarded as a temporary arrangement, which must result in a more logical application of the principle of national unity at the expense of the minor States. At the same time he is by no means an advocate for the unconditional supremacy of Prussia. An appendix contains the full text of the German Constitution, and of the treaties between Prussia and the Southern States.

The dispassionateness and precision which constitute the most distinguishing qualities of Leopold von Ranke ** appear perhaps even to more advantage in minor historical studies than in narratives on a large scale. In the latter we have been taught by great examples to look for something of the grand style, for ornateness of diction, ingenuity of construction, animation of description, and liveliness of feeling. The disappointment produced by the absence of all these attractions is largely tempered when the writer, as here, presents himself from the first in the character of a sedulous scrutinizer of isolated historical problems rather than as a combiner of the general facts of history into an artistic whole. This very agreeable volume, a model of terseness, lucidity, and impartiality, is mainly occupied with researches into obscure or controverted points of the history of the House of Brandenburg, the credit (not too great in Ranke's opinion) due to the memoirs of the Margravine of Bayreuth, the original draft of Frederick's history of his first Silesian campaign, his correspondence with the

* *Das Marcusevangelium und seine synoptischen Parallelen.* Erklärt von Dr. B. Weiss. Berlin: Hertz. London: Nutt.

† *Geschichte und Kritik des Vaticanischen Concils.* Von T. Frommann. Gotha: Perthes. London: Williams & Norgate.

‡ *Verhandlungen der Eisenacher Versammlung zur Besprechung der sozialen Frage am 6. und 7. October 1872.* Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. London: Williams & Norgate.

§ *Die Ideen in der Geschichte. Rectoratreden.* Von Dr. M. Lazarus. Berlin: Dummler. London: Williams & Norgate.

¶ *Der Ursprung der deutschen Stadtverfassung.* Von A. Henaler. Weimar: Böhlaus. London: Williams & Norgate.

|| *Die Verfassung des deutschen Reiches.* Von Joseph von Held. Leipzig: Brockhaus. London: Williams & Norgate.

** *Abhandlungen und Versuche.* Von Leopold von Ranke. Erste Sammlung. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. London: Williams & Norgate.

Prince and Princess of Orange, and the secret history of the fall of his grandfather's Minister, Dankelmann. Information on the last point is chiefly derived from the papers of the English diplomatist Stepney, preserved at the Hague. There is also an interesting essay on the democratic and tyrannical tendencies of the Jesuits, not improbably destined to be revived if the present antagonism between the Church of Rome and the secular power should continue; and another on the origin of the doctrine of the triple authority—legislative, executive, and judicial—which is examined by the light afforded by Milton, Algernon Sydney, and Hobbes.

The discovery that the physiognomies of German statesmen of the last century are in general distinguished by self-complacency has suggested to Herr Sebastian Brunner * the quaint title of his collection of unpublished excerpts from their correspondence. We could well have borne with less humour in the visages if only there had been more in the letters; and when Herr Brunner takes credit for having brought so much unknown matter to light, we feel that we could have accorded him even more if he had left it where he found it. In fact, these two volumes, chiefly made up from the correspondence of diplomatic agents at the Courts of the spiritual princes, contain very little of general value or interest. There are, no doubt, some curious illustrations of the manners of the age, especially as regards its staple occupations of toping and boar-hunting. There is plenty of low intrigue and self-seeking; so that we decidedly agree with the editor that the effect of his collection is not to exalt one's conceptions of the old German Empire in its decrepitude, and we consider that it should tend to put German readers into charity with the French, but for whose interference things would still be much as of old. The pleasantest part of the book is the glimpse it affords of a real patriot and reformer, Joseph II.

The name of the editor of the *Poeta Lyrici Græci* is a sufficient guarantee for the scholarship essential to the satisfactory execution of a history of Greek literature.† It is needless to point out how vastly more ample a scope of acquirement, no less than of original faculty, is necessary for the full mastery of a subject touching at some point or other on nearly every department of human activity; and no higher praise can be bestowed on Herr Bergk than to say that he appears in a fair way to provide the world of letters with a standard work on his magnificent theme. It must, however, be borne in mind that his present volume, treating of the linguistic foundation and earliest beginnings of Greek literature, deals with those portions of the subject in which he may be supposed to be most thoroughly versed. Should his treatment of Grecian history, eloquence, and philosophy prove equally satisfactory, his work may probably occupy such a position towards Ottfried Müller's as Mr. Grote's history holds with reference to Bishop Thirlwall's—superior, not in the genius of the writer, but in the comprehensiveness of the plan. To complete the parallel, Bergk's erudition is less polished and condensed than Müller's, and the work will probably be more acceptable to men of erudition than to readers of general culture. Yet, although the stamp of supreme literary finish may be absent, it is far from being formal, dry, or repulsive, while it excels in masculine common sense. Any deduction from this latter characteristic, should any have to be made, must be on account of the most difficult of the literary historian's problems—the Homeric poems. On the one hand we are highly gratified by the vigour with which Herr Bergk sweeps away the standard sophisms by the aid of which Homer is resolved into a myth. He places him, indeed, a century and a half earlier than usual; and even granting this to be an excess of conservative reaction, his argument for the existence of writing at the period is a powerful contribution to the traditional side of the controversy. We feel more dubious as to the soundness, while unable to refuse admiration to the ingenuity, of the patient analysis by which he strives to establish the existence of two Homers—the inspired bard himself and a later imitator of far inferior faculty, in whose hands the epic assumed nearly its present shape. As he regards the other interpolations as comparatively insignificant, and considers the older and younger Homers as but little removed in point of date, the unity and authenticity of the Iliad are substantially asserted even by this hypothesis. While bestowing the highest eulogiums on the Odyssey, he considers it to be the work of another and a somewhat later writer. The genuineness of Hesiod's *Works and Days* and *Theogony* is maintained, and the interesting chapter on this subject is distinguished by sobriety, due respect for ancient authorities, and willingness to acquiesce in ignorance where ignorance cannot be helped. The volume comes down to the first Olympiad, so that the next will embrace the subject which Bergk has made pre-eminently his own—that of Greek lyrical poetry.

The late Immanuel Bekker's notes in illustration of Homer ‡ are rather of literary than of philological interest. They consist mainly of a series of parallel passages throwing light on the manners and customs described by Homer, selected from the mediæval French and German metrical romances, and from the Mabinogion.

* *Der Humor in der Diplomatik und Regierungskunde des 18. Jahrhunderts.* Von Sebastian Brunner. 2 Bde. Wien: Braumüller. London: Williams & Norgate.

† *Griechische Literaturgeschichte.* Von Th. Bergk. Berlin: Weidmann. London: Asher & Co.

‡ *Homerische Blätter.* Von Immanuel Bekker. Bd. 2. Bonn: Marcus-London: Williams & Norgate.

The field thus indicated may prove fruitful, and would certainly admit of a more ornate and discursive method of treatment than Bekker's, whose style is of the curtest and driest, the very short-hand of literature.

Dr. J. H. Schmidt's great work on Greek metre * is at length completed. It is a herculean labour, requiring even in the reader more knowledge both of Greek and of music than is likely to be often united in the same person. Considering its abstruse character, it seems extraordinary that so bitter a controversy should have been excited by it as seems from the preface to have been the case.

Not much can be said in favour of the two volumes of Prince Pückler-Muskau's letters †, which accompany the biography we noticed last month. The most interesting speculations which they suggest are how Madile Assing ever got hold of them, and how it comes to pass that there is no law in Germany to restrain the publication of the letters of living persons without their consent. We cannot conceive that the permission of Countess Hahn-Hahn or Madile John (E. Marlitt) to the publicity of their familiar correspondence was obtained or even requested; nor that there is anything that these ladies need regret, and in fact the latter exhibits good sense, good feeling, and feminine adroitness in her dealings with her octogenarian beau. Poor Pückler evidently wished to revive the impression of bygone flirtations with Bettina von Arnim, and there is something equally ridiculous and mournful in these vain endeavours to rekindle the simulacrum of a flame that never had warmth enough to burn anybody's fingers. The correspondence with Bettina is a weary business on both sides; some of the other letters, to comparatively undistinguished persons, are less ambitious, but considerably more in earnest.

The especial object of Herr Fritz Krauss's elegant version of Shakespeare's Sonnets ‡ is to render them popular with German lady-readers. He endeavours to attain this end by omitting all after No. 126, and by prefixing a dissertation explanatory of difficulties and ambiguities. His principal guide is Mr. Gerald Massey, and the nature of his solution is indicated by the title of his volume.

Although by this time not a very recent production, J. V. Widmann's *Buddha* § demands a word of notice both on account of the subject and of the qualities displayed in the treatment of it. The poet's theme is the life of Sakhya Muni, in narrating which he adheres pretty closely to tradition, rejecting the grotesque exuberances of Buddhist legend, and interweaving such episodes as appeal most nearly to universal human feeling. The gentle heroism of the ascetic sage is well adapted to poetical treatment, and although the writer is not a bard of the first rank, he is by no means incapable of sustaining, adorning, and diversifying the subject. His metre is the octave stanza, which he handles with great felicity.

The author of *Debit and Credit* would indeed have added a wreath to his laurels if, in his bold attempt at historical fiction in a remote era, he had displayed as much versatility of style as of subject. Unfortunately he is still the same realistic and somewhat prosaic Freytag; his Vandals and Wends are substantially personages of the nineteenth century; and the matter-of-fact exactness which is laudable in a delineation of contemporary manners is fatal to the imaginative instinct which alone can restore the lineaments of a bygone age. At the same time "Ingo and Ingraban" ||, if not picturesque or exciting, are a pair of highly respectable romances; the author has manifestly done his best; we cannot but admire the fulness of his knowledge and the elaboration of his literary workmanship, and must admit that the cause of his failure to bring a vivid picture before the eyes of his readers can only be found in the comparative feebleness of the imaginative faculty which disables him from conceiving one himself. Literary skill has achieved everything within the scope of its resources; but to people the phantom-haunted night of time with substantial figures requires something more than effectiveness in isolated descriptions and a general air of reality in narrative, both of which the work certainly has. "Ingo" is a romance of the middle of the fourth century. "Ingraban" depicts the conflict of German and Slavonic races and religions in the time of Charles Martel. Both are designed as members of a series of tales extending through several ages, the principal actors in which are supposed to be connected by descent, as in Eugène Sue's *Mystères du Peuple*.

The "Seven Deadly Sins," by Robert Hamerling ¶, is a cantata in three parts, respectively depicting the incursion of the representative demons of these vices into our planet, the success which unfortunately attends them, and the rally of mankind and its auxiliary angels for their expulsion. The whole is too obviously fanciful, but there is no lack of lyrical feeling, either in the spirited diction or in the partly rhymed, partly alliterative metre.

* *Griechische Metrik.* (Die Kunstdenkmale der Griechischen Poesie, Bd. 4.) Von Dr. J. H. Schmidt. Leipzig: Vogel. London: Nutt.

† *Briefwechsel und Tagebücher des Fürsten Hermann von Pückler-Muskau.* Herausgegeben von L. Assing. 2 Bde. Hamburg: Hoffmann & Campe. London: Asher & Co.

‡ *Shakespeare's Southampton-Sonette.* Deutsches von F. Krauss. Leipzig: Engelmann. London: Williams & Norgate.

§ *Buddha. Epische Dichtung.* Von J. V. Widmann. Bern: Dalp. London: Nutt.

|| *Ingo und Ingraban.* Von Gustav Freytag. Leipzig: Hirzel. London: Williams & Norgate.

¶ *Die Sieben Todsünden. Ein Gedicht.* Von Robert Hamerling. Hamburg: Richter. London: Siegle.

The Saturday Review.

[January 18, 1873.]

CLERICAL, MEDICAL, and GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

Established 1821.

Directors.

Chairman.—The Right Hon. JOHN ROBERT MOWBRAY, M.P., D.C.L.

Deputy-Chairmen.

WILLIAM BOWMAN, Esq., F.R.S.
Sir CHARLES LOCOCK, Bart., D.C.L., F.R.S.

Jas. M. Arnott, Esq., F.R.S.
Lionel S. Beauclerc, M.B., F.R.S.
Patrick Black, M.D.
Charles Bowes, Esq.
Arthur Farre, M.D., F.R.S.
Professor Humphry, M.D., F.R.S.
Rev. John Edw. Kempe, M.A.

Gerard W. Lydekker, Esq., M.A.
Rev. Richard Fletcher, D.D.
Sir James Milner, Bart.
Sir Jas. Paget, Bt., D.C.L., F.R.S.
George H. Pinckard, Esq.
Thomas Prudgins Teale, M.B.
Sir Fredk. M. Williams, Bt., M.P.

Actuary and Secretary.—GEORGE CUTCLIFFE, Esq.
Assistant Actuary.—BENJAMIN NEWBATT, Esq.

FINANCIAL RESULTS.

The Annual Income, steadily increasing exceeds	£17,000
The Assurance Fund, safely invested, is over	£180,000
The New Policies in the last year were 515, assuring	£27,740
The New Annual Premiums were	£3,031
The Total Premium by Death and amount to	£2,292
The Subsisting Assurances and Bonuses amount to	£2,373

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES.

CREDIT SYSTEM.—On any Policy for the whole duration of a healthy Life, where the age does not exceed 60, one half of the Annual Premiums during the first five years may remain on credit.

ENDOWMENT ASSURANCES may be effected, without Profits, by which the Sum Assured becomes payable on the attainment of a specified age, or at death, whichever event shall first happen.

INVALID LIVES may be assured at rates proportioned to the increased risk.

PROMPT SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS.—Claims paid thirty days after proof of death.

BONUS.

The Reversionary Bonus at the Quinquennial Division in January, 1872 (amounting to £25,571) averaged 9 per cent., and the Cash Bonus 29 per cent. on the Premiums paid in the five years.

The next Division of Profits will take place in January, 1877, and Persons who effect New Policies before the end of June next will be entitled at that Division to one year's additional share of Profits over later Entrants.

REPORT, 1872.

The Annual Report just issued, and the Balance Sheets for the year ending June 30, 1872, as rendered to the Board of Trade, can be obtained of any of the Society's Agents, or of

GEORGE CUTCLIFFE, *Actuary and Secretary,*
13 St. James's Square, London, S.W.

LOSS of LIFE or LIMB, with the CONSEQUENT

LOSS of TIME and MONEY CAUSED by

ACCIDENTS of ALL KINDS, PROVIDED for by a POLICY of the

RAILWAY PASSENGERS' ASSURANCE COMPANY.

ESTABLISHED 1849.

CAPITAL ONE MILLION, FULLY SUBSCRIBED,

OFFERS UNDOUBTED SECURITY.

INVESTED CAPITAL and RESERVE FUND, £130,000.

A N ANNUAL PAYMENT of £3 to £6 5s. INSURES £1,000 AT DEATH.

O R an ALLOWANCE at the RATE of £6 PER WEEK for TOTAL DISABLEMENT by INJURY.

INSURERS of FIVE YEARS' STANDING

SHARE in REALIZED PROFITS.

MARINE ASSURANCE AGAINST LOSS of LIFE at SEA.

INSURANCE AGAINST RAILWAY ACCIDENTS ALONE.

BY the JOURNEY or by PERIODS of TIME,

AT ALL RAILWAY STATIONS.

A SK for an INSURANCE TICKET WHEN YOU PAY YOUR RAILWAY FARE.

A NNUAL INCOME, £150,000.

S EVEN HUNDRED and TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND POUNDS have been PAID as COMPENSATION,

F OR 37,500 CLAIMS from ACCIDENTS of EVERY DESCRIPTION,

WALKING, RIDING, DRIVING, HUNTING,

S HOOTING, FISHING, TRAVELLING, or at HOME.

P ROMPT and LIBERAL SETTLEMENT of CLAIMS.

F OR TERMS and CONDITIONS,

A PPLY to the CLERKS at the RAILWAY STATIONS,

T O the LOCAL AGENTS,

O R at the OFFICES,

N O. 64 CORNHILL, and 10 REGENT STREET.

WILLIAM J. VIAN, SECRETARY.

I MPERIAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Established 1865.

1 OLD BROAD STREET, E.C., and 16 and 17 PALL MALL, S.W.

CAPITAL, £1,000,000. PAID UP AND INVESTED, £700,000.

JAMES HOLLAND, Superintendent.

THE AGRA BANK, Limited.—Established in 1833.

CAPITAL, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS LANE, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON.
BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

Current Accounts are kept at the Head Office on the Terms customary with London Bankers, and Interest allowed when the Credit Balance does not fall below £100.

Deposits received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:

At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 12 months' Notice of Withdrawal.

For shorter periods Deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

Bills allowed at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank, free of extra charge; and Approved Bills purchased or sent for collection.

Sales and Purchases effected in British and Foreign Securities, in East India Stock and Loans, and the safe custody of the same.

Investments in Gold, Arms, Navy, and Civil Pay and Pensions realized.

Every other description of Banking Business and Money Agency, British and Indian, transacted.

J. THOMSON, Chairman.

P H O E N I X F I R E O F F I C E , L O M B A R D S T R E E T A N D C H A R I N G C R O S S , L O N D O N . — E S T A B L I S H E D 1782.

Prompt and liberal Loss Settlements.

Insurances effected in all parts of the World.

GEO. W. LOVELL, Secretary.

E A G L E I N S U R A N C E C O M P A N Y .

Established 1807. (For Lives only.)

79 PALL MALL, LONDON.

Income from Premiums £146,279

from Interest 132,049

Accumulated Funds 3,169,699

Also, a Subscribed Capital of £1,000,000. The Expenses of Management are under 3 per cent.

GEORGE HUMPHREYS, *Actuary and Secretary.*

WINTER SEASON.—GRANVILLE HOTEL, St. Lawrence-on-Sea, Thanet.—During the Winter Month a Reduction of 25 per cent. will be made upon Apartments taken by the week. Board, £3 3s. per week; Apartments according to size and position; Attendance, 1s. a day. Hydrostatic, Turkish, or one and every description of Baths in the Hotel. Table-d'hôte, 6s. 3d. p.m.

B R I T O N . — B E D F O R D H O T E L . — Every endeavour is made to render this Hotel equal to its long-existing repute. Spacious Coffee Room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Sea-Water Service in the Hotel.—Communications to The MANAGER, Bedford Hotel Company, Limited.

E D E N & C O . , 61 S T R A N D , W.C., and 34 R O Y A L E X C H A N G E , E.C., and T U R R E T C L O C K S . — M a n u f a c t u r e r s o f C H R O N O M E T E R S , W A T C H E S , A S T R O N O M I C A L H O U S E , and T U R R E T C L O C K S f o r H e r M a j e s t y , a n d H.R.H. the Prince of Wales; Makers of the Great Clock of the House of Parliament, and the New Standard Clock of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich. Catalogues on application.

E. DENT & CO., 61 Strand, and 34 Royal Exchange (adjoining Lloyd's), and the Factory, Savoy Street, Strand, London.

F E N D E R S , S T O V E S , K I T C H E N R A N G E S , F I R E - I R O N S , and C H I M N E Y - P I E C E S . — B u y e r s o f t h e a b o v e a r e r e q u i s e d , b e f o r e f i n d i n g , t o v i s i t t h e S H O W - R O O M S . T h e y c o n t a i n s u c h a n a s s o r t m e n t o f F e n d e r s , S t o v e s , R a n g e s , C h i m n e y - p i e c e s , F l a n k e r s , a n d G e n e r a l I r o n m o n g e r y , a s c a n n o t b e a p p r o a c h e d e l s i c h e r e , e i t h e r f o r s i n g l e l o a d , o r p a c k e d , o r i n q u i s i t i o n s o f w e i g h t , s i z e , o r p r i c e .

Black Register Stoves from 9s. 9d. to 29s.
Bright ditto, with Ornamental Ornaments from £3 12s. to £3 10s.
Bronzed Fenders from 4s. to £5 12s.
Steel and Ornamental Fenders from £2 17s. to £25.
Chimney-pieces from £1 10s. to £100.
Fire-irons (Set of Three) from 4s. to £5 10s.

C O A L S C O O P S . — W I L L I A M S . B U R T O N has 400 different

Patterns of COAL SCOOPS on SHOW, of which he invites inspection. The Prices vary from 2s. 4d. to 15s. Plain Black open Scoops, from 3s. 4d.; do. zinc-lined, from 5s. 3d.; curved Box Scoops, from 6s. ditto, with Hand-Scoop, from 12s. 6d.; do. do., with fancy ornaments, from 1s. 6d. to 15s.; hand-finished and ornamental, and fitted with imitation ivory handles, from 2s. 6d. to 15s. There is also a choice selection of Wooden Coal Boxes, with iron and brass mountings.

WILLIAM S. BURTON, General Furnishing Ironmonger, by appointment, to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, sends a CATALOGUE, containing upwards of 850 Illustrations of his unrivalled Stock, with List of Prices and Plans of the 30 large Shows, post-free.—30 Finsbury Place, W.C., 1, 2, 3, 4, and 4 New Bond Street; 4, 5, and 6 Petty's Place; and 1 Newgate Yard, London, W.C. The Cost of delivering Goods to the most distant parts of the United Kingdom by Railway is trifling. WILLIAM S. BURTON will always undertake delivery at a small fixed rate.

W A N T E D to PURCHASE some OLD ARTIFICIAL TEETH.—Persons having the above to SELL can forward them by post or otherwise, and their value will be sent per return.—Address, Mr. E. BROWNING, Dentist, 3 Chilworth Street, Paddington, London.

S T A I N E D G L A S S W I N D O W S and C H U R C H D E C O R A T I O N S . — HEATON, BUTLER, & BAYNE, Garrick Street, Covent Garden, London. Prize Medal, London and Paris.

P A R Q U E T F U R N I T U R E . — H O W A R D ' S P A T E N T .

Furniture of all descriptions made of HOWARD'S PATENT PARQUET is of the most durable kind, and (being manufactured by Machinery) moderate in cost; the workmanship is, notwithstanding, of the finest possible quality. Combining Parqueterie with Wood Tapistry, residences may be fitted up without either painting or paper hanging.

HOWARD & SONS.

Decorators and Cabinet Makers by Steam Power, 25, 26, and 27 Berners Street, London, W.

T R E E S , S H R U B S , &c.—T H E H E A T H E R S I D E C O L L E C T I O N .

LETTINGS, forming together, for £51, a complete Arboretum, equal in variety to some of the finest in Europe.

THOMAS THORNTON, Heathside Nurseries, Bagshot, Surrey, offers a Collection of all the FINEST and NEWEST HARDY TREES and SHRUBS HITHERO INTRODUCED, in Seven Series of 50 Species each, One Plant to each Species, viz. :-

No. 1—50 distinct species of Conifers, including the best and newest.....	for £3 6
2—50 " " " tall Deciduous Trees and Shrubs (not Conifers).....	8 5
3—50 " " " flowering and fruit-bearing Shrubs.....	10
4—50 " " " climbing and trailing Plants.....	2 4
5—50 named varieties of Rhododendrons, including the finest and newest.....	6 10
7—50 " " " Fruit Trees of various sorts.....	3 5

Each Collection may be had separately, or the whole for..... £11 0

When more than one of each species in a Collection is taken, a corresponding reduction will be made in price.

The Plants sent will range from 1 to 7 feet in height.

The Plants will be carefully packed (without charge), and will be delivered (free) at either the Farnborough, Blackwater, or Sunningdale Stations.

Terms.—Net Cash on or before delivery. All unknown Correspondents will please accompany their order with a Bank Reference. Payment to be made at the Bagshot office. Cheques crossed London and County Bank, to the Aldershot Branch of which Bank T. THORNTON begs to refer as to his trustworthiness.

C L A R K ' S P A T E N T S T E E L N O I S E L E S S S H U T T E R S .

Self-Colling, Fire and Thief Proof, can be adapted to any Window or other Opening. Prospectuses free.—CLARK & CO., Sole Patentees, Rathbone Place, W.; Paris, Manchester, Liverpool, and Dublin.

C O L D C R E A M of R O S E S .

In Jars, 1s.

PIESSE & LUBIN prepare this exquisite Cosmetic with the greatest care, fresh daily. Cold Cream Soap, free from alkali, 2s. per lb. Sold by all fashionable Druggists and Perfumers. Ask for PIESSE & LUBIN's manufactures to prevent disappointment.—Laboratory of Flowers, 2 New Bond Street, London.

I R O N W I N E B I N S . — F A R R O W & J A C K S O N (Business established 1798). First Wine-Bins invented and made by the late Mr. FARROW in 1798. First Wine-Bins with separate bottles for each bottle, and arrangement so that the necks of the bottles are outwards, an advantage peculiar to this form of Wine-Bin, registered by them March 26, 1873.—18 Great Tower Street, 8 Haymarket, 21 Mansell Street, London; and 23 Rue du Pont Neuf, Paris.

SALT & CO.'S EAST INDIA PALE and BURTON ALES, in Bottles, also in Cask, in the finest Condition. CHAMPAGNE—Bordeaux, 4s.; Côte Blanche, 3s.; Sillery, 2s.; Médoc, 2s. per dozen. PORT—Cockburn's Old Crusted, 4s.; 3s.; 2s.; Draught, 2s. per dozen. SHERRY—Fino, 3s.; Fino, 3s.; Pale or Gold, 2s. per dozen. CLARET—Good, 1s.; Superior, 1s.; 1s.; 1s. per dozen. MOODY & CO., 49 Lime Street, London, E.C.

99